# The Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
283.05
CHUO
v.21

THE

# Church of England Pulpit,

AND

# ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

JANUARY TO JUNE, 1886.

VOL. XXI.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160, FLEET STREET, E.C.

# CONTENTS OF VOL. XXI.


SERMONS ON :— PAGE

The Kingdom of God.—I—By Very Rev. R. W. Church, M.A. ... ... ... ... ... 1
The Kingdom of God.—II.—By Very Rev. R. W. Church, M.A. ... ... ... ... ... 13
Circumspection—By Rev. G. Jannings, M.A. ... 25
Hope—By Very Rev. R. W. Church, M.A. ... 37
The Name "Christian"—By the Late Very Rev. James Howie ... ... ... ... ... 49
The Beloved Physician—By Rev. James A. Carr... 52
The Potter and the Clay—By Rev. Augustus W. Gurney, M.A. ... ... ... ... ... 61
On Waste in Nature—By Rev. Professor Bonney ... 64
Religion and Revelation—By Rev. J. M. Wilson ... 73
Patience—By Right Rev. the Bishop of Meath ... 85
Home Claims and Emigration—By Rev. John Napleton ... ... ... ... ... ... 88
On Hearing Sermons—By Rev. A. W. Momerie ... 97
Self-Sacrifice for Love's Sake—By Rev. Augustus W. Gurney ... ... ... ... ... 109
The Right of Private Judgment—By Rev. E. Martyn Venn, B.A. ... ... ... ... ... 112
Surnames and Christian Names—By Lord Bishop of Peterborough ... ... ... ... ... 121
Union to Christ—By Rev. George Salmon, D.D. ... 133
The Baptismal Inheritance—By Lord Bishop of Peterborough ... ... ... ... ... 145
Salvation not Instantaneous—By Lord Bishop of Peterborough ... ... ... ... ... 157
A Dean's First Words in his Cathedral—By Very Rev. John Gott, D.D. ... ... ... ... 159
The Christian Ministry—By Rev. Phillips Brooks... 169
Evolution and the Incarnation—By Rev. Professor Bonney, D.Sc. ... ... ... ... ... 181
The Duty of Strength—By Very Rev. Dean Vaughan 193
Three Books of God—By Rev. Gordon Calthrop ... 196
Praise—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, B.D.... ... 205
The Pharisee in the Temple—By Rev. A. Plummer 217
Christian Privilege and Obligation—By Rev. Charles Edward Tisdall, D.D. ... ... ... ... 219
Christ Washing His Disciples' Feet—By Very Rev. John C. Macdonnell, D.D. ... ... ... 229
Reasonable Inquiry *v.* Reprehensible Doubting—By Rev. A. D. Pringle, M.A. ... ... ... 232
Moses Smites the Rock—By Rev. J. E. Kempe .. 241
Miracles and the Law of Nature—By Rev. Professor Bonney, D.Sc. ... ... ... ... ... 243
Pomps and Vanities—By Lord Bishop of Peterborough ... ... ... ... ... ... 253
An Ordination Sermon—By Very Rev. F. Swift ... 255

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

How to Overcome the World—By Rev. A. D. Pringle, M.A. ... ... ... ... ... ... 257
The Indian and Colonial Exhibition—By Rev. A. D. Pringle, M.A.... ... ... ... ... 265
The Living Hope—By Rev. G. Jannings, M.A. ... 267
Necessity of Belief—By Lord Bishop of Peterborough 277
The Nature, the History, and the Hope of Tolerance—By Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D. ... ... 279
The Home and the Family—Bishop of Sodor and Man .. ... ... ... ... ... ... 289
Law, Progress and Citizenship—By Rev. George Bladon, B.A. ... ... ... ... ... 292
The Victory that Overcometh the World—By Rev. Canon Roberts, M.A. ... ... ... ... ... 301
National Disruption—By Rev. Sir Emilius Bayley, Bart., B.D. ... ... ... ... ... 303

SERMONS BY :—

Bishop of Peterborough—Surnames and Christian Names ... ... ... ... ... ... 121
Bishop of Peterborough—The Baptismal Inheritance ... ... ... ... ... ... 145
Bishop of Peterborough—Salvation not Instantaneous ... ... ... ... ... ... 157
Bishop of Peterborough—Pomps and Vanities ... 253
Bishop of Peterborough—Necessity of Belief ... 277
Bishop of Meath—Patience ... ... ... ... 85
Bishop of Sodor and Man—The Home and the Family ... ... ... ... ... ... 289
Church, Dean—The Kingdom of God.—I.... ... 1
Church, Dean—The Kingdom of God.—II. ... 13
Church, Dean—Hope ... ... ... ... ... 37
Gott, Dean, D.D.—A Dean's First Words in His Cathedral ... ... ... ... ... ... 159
Howie, Late Dean—The Name "Christian" ... 49
Macdonnell, Very Rev. John C., D.D.—Christ Washing His Disciples' Feet ... ... ... 229
Swift, Very Rev. Dean—An Ordination Sermon ... 255
Vaughan, Dean, D.D.—The Duty of Strength ... 193
Bayley, Rev. Sir Emilius, Bart., B.D.—National Disruption... ... ... ... ... ... 303
Bonney, Professor T. G.—On Waste in Nature ... 64
Bonney, Professor T. G.—Evolution and the Incarnation ... ... ... ... ... ... 181
Bonney, Professor T. G.—Miracles and the Law of Nature ... ... ... ... ... ... 243
Bladon, Rev. George, B.A.—Law, Progress and Citizenship... ... ... ... ... ... 292

283.05
CHU
1.21

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Brooks, Rev. Phillips, D.D. — The Christian Ministry ... ... ... ... .. ... 169
Brooks, Rev. Phillips, D.D.—The Nature, the History and the Hope of Tolerance ... ... 279
Carr, Rev. James A., LL.D.—The Beloved Physician ... ... ... ... ... ... 52
Calthrop, Rev. Gordon, M.A.—Three Books of God ... ... ... ... ... ... 196
Gurney, Rev. Augustus W., M.A.—The Potter and the Clay ... ... ... .. ... .. 61
Gurney, Rev. Augustus W., M.A.—Self-Sacrifice for Love's Sake ... ... ... ... ... 109
Jannings, Rev. G., M.A.—Circumspection ... ... 25
Jannings, Rev. G., M.A.—The Living Hope ... 267
Kempe, Rev. J. E., M.A.—Moses Smites the Rock 241
Momerie, Rev. A. W., M.A.—On Hearing Sermons 97
Napleton, Rev. John—Home Claims and Emigration 88
Naylor, Rev. Thomas B., B.D.—Praise ... ... 205
Pringle, Rev. A. D., M.A.—Reasonable Inquiry *v.* Reprehensible Doubting ... ... ... ... 232
Pringle, Rev. A. D., M.A.—How to Overcome the World ... ... ... ... ... ... 257
Pringle, Rev. A. D., M.A.—The Indian and Colonial Exhibition ... ... ... ... 265
Plummer, Rev. A., D.D.—The Pharisee in the Temple ... ... ... ... ... ... 217
Roberts, Rev. Canon, M.A.—The Victory that Overcometh the World ... ... ... ... 301
Salmon, Rev. George, D.D.—Union to Christ ... 133
Tisdall, Rev. Charles Edward, D.D.—Christian Privilege and Obligation... ... ... ... 219
Venn, Rev. E. Martyn, B.A.—The Right of Private Judgment ... ... ... ... ... .. 112
Wilson, Rev. J. M., M.A.—Religion and Revelation 73

LEADING ARTICLES :—

The Study of German ... ... ... ... ... 6
Church Reform... ... ... ... 17, 29, 67
Home Rule ... ... ... ... ... 42, 294
Translation of Bishop Moorhouse ... ... ... 43
Lay Representation in the Church ... ... ... 55
A Lesson from History ... ... ... ... 55
Criticism ... ... ... ... ... ... 67
Benefits of Lay Representation ... ... ... 77
Maintenance of the Clergy ... ... ... ... 90
German Literature : A Political Parable ... ... 101
Clerical Incomes ... ... ... ... ... 116
Church Patronage.—I., II., III., IV. 127, 140, 152, 161
Thrift ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 128
The B.D. Degree of Durham... ... ... ... 175
Our New Legislators .. ... ... .. ... 185
Wear and Tear of Modern Life ... ... ... 199
Free Trade ... ... ... ... ... ... 211
Health of the Soul Dependent of the Body... ... 221
New Political Truths ... ... ... ... ... 236
Queen Anne's Bounty ... ... ... ... ... 247
Clergy Sustentation ... ... ... ... ... 259
The Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association ... ... ... ... ... 260
Preaching ... ... ... ... ... ... 270
The Social Mission of the Church ... ... ... 283
Mr. Gladstone's Defeat ... ... ... ... 284
Browning ... ... ... ... ... ... 308

PAPERS :—

The National Biography of the Old Testament—By Rev. George Bladon, B.A. ... ... .. 28
The Purity of Heaven—By Joseph John Murphy ... 41
Sacrifice—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, D.D. ... 78
Two Pictures—By Rev. Canon Courtenay Moore... 100
Antagonism between Dogma and Philosophy—By Rev. A. W. Momerie, M.A. ... ... ... 122
Swedenborg as an Interpreter of Scripture—By Rev. G. W. Allen ... ... ... ... .. 146

PAPERS :— PAGE

The Groaning of Creation and of the Christian—By Rev. Daniel Bagot, D.D. ... ... ... 200
A Suggested Eirenicon for Christendom—By Rev. Richard H. Hawkes, M.A. ... ... ... 208
The Late Professor F. D. Maurice ... ... ... 286

CORRESPONDENCE :—

Disendowment ... ... ... ... ... 7, 20, 31
James v. 11 ... ... ... 8, 21, 32, 46, 69
Ecce Iterum Crispinus... ... ... ... ... 9
The Statute Law Concerning Affinities ... 9, 21
Kindness to Animals ... ... ... ... ... 9
Children's Convalescent Homes ... ... ... 10
St. Paul's Inspiration and Teaching... ... ... 18
Irish Church ... ... ... ... 21, 45, 191, 204
Disestablishment and Disendowment ... 22, 35
Subordinate Chambers ... ... ... ... 31
German Literature.—A Modern Sceptic ... ... 32
Election—St. Paul on Isaiah, etc. ... ... ... 33
Church Reform... ... ... ... ... ... 33
Romish Language and Doctrine ... ... ... 34
The Irish Question ... ... ... 44, 57, 69, 80
Church Reform—"Feed my Lambs" ... ... 45
Were Eutyches, Theodoret, and Pope Gelasius agreed? or which was the Heretic? ... ... 45
Buchananisms ... ... ... ... ... ... 58
The New Bishop of Manchester ... ... ... 59
Acts xix. 2 ... ... ... ... ... ... 59
Semi-Christian Scepticism in the *Times* ... ... 68
Reform or Disestablishment ... ... ... ... 70
The Real Presence.—The Church Catechism ... 70
Criticism ... ... ... ... ... ... 81
The Destruction of the Herd of Swine ... ... 82
"Roman Daylight" ... ... ... ... ... 82
Mr. A. Gurney—Adoration ... ... ... ... 82
The Primate ... ... ... ... ... ... 82
Ireland ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 83
Eucharistic Worship ... ... ... ... 91, 107
Archbishop Benson on Evening Communion ... 92
The Demons and the Swine ... ... ... 92, 104
Mr. Gurney and Home Rule ... ... ... ... 93
A Dilemma! The Gorham Decision, or the Charitable Hypothesis—Which? ... ... ... 95
The Irish and British Question ... 102, 117, 129
Home Rule ... ... ... ... ... ... 104
Church Patronage and Pews ... ... ... ... 105
Emigration ... ... ... ... ... 105, 118
Justice Blind ... ... ... ... ... ... 107
The Parliamentary Oath ... ... ... ... 107
Local Government for the Groves of Blarney ... 119
The Cause of all our Social Misery ... ... ... 128
Reforms in the Church ... ... ... ... 130
Ritualism, Clerical and Lay ... ... ... ... 130
The Black Rubric Again 131, 142, 155, 179, 188, 213, 225, 249
Hospitals and Orphanages ... ... ... ... 141
The Welsh Church Case and the Irish ... ... 143
The Proposed New B.D. at Durham ... ... 143
Free Trade 144, 154, 164, 176, 186, 202, 214, 222, 237, 248, 260, 272, 284, 295
Dogma and Philosophy ... ... ... 153, 178
Protection to Native Industry ... ... ... 163
Patriotism ... ... ... ... ... ... 164
The Black Rubric in the *Church Times* ... ... 164
Controversial Candour... ... ... ... ... 164
St. Paul the Author of the Acts and of the Third Gospel ... ... ... 178, 190, 203, 213, 223
Farmers—Irish Boards of Nomination ... ... 178
Is Silence an Effective Corrector of Error ... 179, 189
The Larger Hope ... ... 190, 212, 224, 238
The Pressing Question of the Hour ... ... ... 212
Soul and Conscience ... ... ... ... ... 239
Burial Reform ... ... ... ... ... ... 239
Hold Fast the Form of Sound Words ... ... 239

988255

CORRESPONDENCE :— PAGE

Self Denial ... ... 249, 261, 271, 285, 297, 309
Earth to Earth Burial ... ... ... ... ... ... 250
What can a Spiritual Body do? What is a Spiritual Body? ... ... ... ... ... ... 261
Dishonesty on Both Sides ... ... ... ... 262
Miracles and the Law of Nature ... ... ... 272
A Reply to an Inquiry ... ... ... ... 285
Belfast Riots ... ... ... ... ... ... 296
The Crisis ... ... ... ... ... ... 296
Our Colours ... ... ... ... ... ... 310
What will the Journals Say? ... ... ... ... 310
Hades not Hell... ... ... ... ... ... 311

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"Mr. Gladstone: A Retrospect and a Prospect" —By George Anthony Denison, Vicar of East Brent and Archdeacon of Taunton ... ... 11
*The Expositor*, January, 1886 .. ... ... ... 23
*The Monthly Interpreter* 23, 83, 119, 179, 226, 273
"Marius the Epicurean: His Sensations and Ideas" —By Walter Pater, M.A. ... ... ... 23
"The Seven Gifts"—By Edward White, Archbishop ... ... ... ... ... ... 46
"Church Echoes"—By Mrs. Carey Brock ... ... 71
"Healing by Faith: or, Primitive Mind-Cure" —By W. F. Evans ... ... ... ... 71
"The Mystery of God"—By T. Vincent Tymms... 83
"Hymns"—By Very Rev. Daniel Bagot, D.D. ... 108
"St. Paul the Author of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Third Gospel"—By H. Heber Evans, Vicar of Mapperley ... ... ... ... 165
"Expositions"—By Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D. ... 167
"Good and Evil in their Relation to the Dispensation of Providence"—By George Wall, F.L.S., F.R.A.S. ... ... ... ... ... ... 168
"The Diaconate of Women in the Anglican Church" —By Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., late Dean of Chester, with a short Biographical Sketch by his Son... ... ... ... ... ... 191
"Haggai and Zechariah"...By Venerable T. T. Perowne, B.D., Archdeacon of Norwich, late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge... 215
"A Life of Joseph Hall, D.D., Bishop of Exeter and Norwich"—By Rev. George Lewis, B.A. 226
"Short Studies in Ecclesiastical History and Biography"—By the Rev. H. N. Oxenham ... 226

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :— PAGE

"The Trinity of Evil"—By Canon Wilberforce ... 250
"Lectures on Church Doctrine"—By Rev. V. H. Stanton and others ... ... ... ... 262
"Man's Knowledge of God"—By Richard Acland Armstrong, B.A.... ... ... ... ... 273
"Sermons by Mark Pattison" ... ... ... 273
"England that is to Be"—By Rev. W. B. Philpot, M.A. (Oxon), Vicar of South Bersted by Bognor 297
"The Doctrine of the Church of England on the Holy Communion, restated as a guide at the present time"—By the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M.A., with a Preface by the Bishop of Winchester ... ... ... ... ... 298

MISCELLANEOUS :—

Hymns for Sundays ... 6, 95, 139, 202, 247, 311
Church Reform ... ... ... 35, 36, 168, 263
The Girls' Friendly Society ... ... ... ... 36
Lord Selbourne on Disestablishment ... 95, 251
Memorial Tablet to the Bishop of Manchester ... 95
Bishop of Oxford on Language ... ... ... 96
Pusey Library at Oxford ... ... ... ... 120
Funeral Reform ... ... 131, 144, 240, 263
The B.D. Degree at Durham ... ... ... 132
The Trinity College Mission ... ... ... ... 132
The Extension of the Diaconate ... ... ... 155
Tithes ... ... ... ... ... ... 156, 192
St. Bartholomew's Church, Smithfield ... ... 192
Archbishop Trench ... ... . . ... ... 204
Wesleyan Ministers and Bishop Moorhouse ... 264
Professor Cheyne on Heinrich Ewald ... ... 275
May Festival at Westow ... ... ... ... 275
Rev. W. Tuckwell and Allotments ... ... ... 275
Bishop Moorhouse on Board Schools ... ... 311

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

CLERICAL OBITUARY 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

# The Church of England Pulpit

AND

# ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XXI.—No. 523. SATURDAY, JANUARY 2, 1886. PRICE TWOPENCE.


## The Church of England Pulpit.

### THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—I.


BY THE VERY REV. R. W. CHURCH, M.A., DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.


SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, ON SUNDAY, DECEMBER 5TH, 1885.

"Now, after John was cast into prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God."—ST. MARK i. 14.

"THE kingdom of God," "the kingdom of heaven," are among the most familiar of religious expressions. In the Bible they have applications more or less limited and special, according to the context; just as our phrase "the Crown" carries with it distinct associations, and stands for powers and functions, differing in sphere and attributes, though through them all runs a connecting thread—according as the Crown is spoken of in its legal, or administrative, or political, or personal relations. The kingdom of God brings with it sometimes God's rule over the universe, sometimes His rule in souls and consciences and wills; sometimes we see it revealed in the Church on earth, sometimes we look forward to it in the triumph of its Lord at the end of all things. But the "kingdom of God" is one of the great themes of the Bible; indeed it may be said to comprehend them all. For in its fullest and most complete meaning is embraced all that God is to the things which He has made; all that God is to men, who alone of creatures here are capable of knowing Him and loving Him—all that He has done for them, and is doing for them now. When we grasp all that is implied in our words, the "kingdom of God" is as great a subject to our thoughts, as it is natural and common in the language of religion.

The belief in God, the Lord and Ruler of the world and men, meets us, of course, in the first words of the Bible as much as in the last; and this involves the idea of the "kingdom of God." But the idea of the kingdom of God as one vast system, though always implicitly present to the minds of those who knew and served Him, has not been always equally full and equally clear. Like other great truths of religion, it has unfolded its significance gradually. Often obscured even to good men, by the pressure of things visible and sensible, by trouble, by the struggle and business of life, by the customs and prejudices of men, it only step by step disengaged itself from all that clouded it, and gathered more and more its light and its power over the souls of men. The history of the Bible is the record, among other things, of the growth in definiteness, in full consciousness, in its supremacy over all counter-influences of sight and nature and habit, of the idea of the kingdom of the invisible God. We see in that long and varied history of religion, how this great idea presented itself with more and more precision to the minds and imaginations of the servants of God, how it wrought upon their souls, how it gained for itself the distinct and recognised name by which it was henceforth to be known. We may trace, from the early days to the later, how this idea, "the kingdom of God," received, under the inspired discipline of successive generations, increasing illumination, increasing substance and reality, till at length it came to mean all that Jesus Christ meant for us, when He came preaching "the kingdom of God," the Gospel of the kingdom.

The outlines of this great object of religious faith and thought, the "kingdom of God," were distinct and prominent in patriarchal religion. When Abraham believed the call and promise of God, when he "lifted up his hand to the Lord, the Possessor of heaven and earth," when he made his servant swear by the "Lord, the God of heaven and the God of the earth," he confessed, though he had not named it, the "kingdom of God." It was the foundation of his absolute and ungrudging faith—that faith, that recognition of God's claim upon him, by which he is said to have been in a special sense "justified"—that faith by which he became the type and exemplar of generous and heroic obedience—obedience to One Who was

worthy of his boundless loyalty, Who was more to him than all the world, more to him than his only son. And this faith of Abraham in the Most High God, "the Possessor," as He is called in the story of Melchizedek, "the Possessor of heaven and earth," was the heritage left by Abraham to his children and his race. What it was to Abraham in his outward acts we know; what it was to him in the inner thought and feelings of his soul is hidden from us. Only we know that he is called by inspired lips "the friend of God." Only we know that One Who knows everything from end to end said of him, "Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad."

"The kingdom of God"—the phrase had not yet been uttered; the depths and compass of the thought had not been fathomed and explored; but the whole history of the patriarchs first, and of Israel afterwards, revealed the presence and activity of the belief. In His dealings and relations with the people of His purpose and choice, God, though He was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of Israel, was yet remembered as, beyond all that, the King and Ruler of all things: the King and Lord of all men, the "Judge of all the earth." The "kingdom of God" was indeed in a very definite sense the Church of the old dispensation, the Church which was in the tents of Jacob, the Church "which was in the wilderness," the Church whose holy places were at Shiloh and on Sion. There God was recognised, "My King of old." So it was that the memory of the kingdom of God was preserved among men; so it was that the hope was kept alive of that Church universal which was to be, and which was to be at last the visible witness of God's kingdom before the eyes of men. The Jews, we know, misunderstood the meaning of their calling. As is so natural to our narrow and limited thought, to our selfishness and readiness to believe in exclusiveness and favouritism, they were even tempted to confine the kingdom of God to what was but a portion of it. But they might have known better; they might, if they had not chosen to be blind, have read a very different meaning in their great privileges, and the wonders which had been done for them. Their own belief, their own professions, witnessed, if they would have heeded, that their Lord was the Lord of all things, of all the families of the earth, of all souls which He had made. St. Paul's question might have been asked and answered, at any moment of the history of Israel—"Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also."

Israel believed that the "Lord is King;" they believed, that is, in a "kingdom of God." But words and beliefs may be familiar to us without our always recognising what they mean, and all that is contained in them. A phrase, a doctrine, a discovery, a theory, a deep-reaching principle, the watchword and keynote of a whole philosophy, may be in our mouths, may be in our minds, in a neutralised and inactive state, without life, without influence. The dry seed lies on the ground, as dead, and "abideth alone;" it may lie there and perish. But, nursed by kindly suns and showers, it may wake up and slowly rise and spread into the mighty tree, the glory and delight of the landscape, ringed with its hundred years of growth. So it is with our ideas and convictions. They may go on, the greatest of them, dead, inert, powerless, fruitless, till they have found their interpreter; till they have found that answering sympathy and intelligence of the soul, which sees all that is in them with the inner eye of the mind, which illuminates, unfolds, applies them, and animates with them the realities of things. Till this time comes, the highest, the richest of ideas may fall unmeaning on an uncongenial age or an alien temper of society; we may listen to its expression with barren respect, utterly failing to measure its reach, or discern its wealth. And so continually, even after it has been living, it may pass under new conditions into the empty formula; and the faith which once had felt and imagined and loved, sink into the languid habit of acquiescence. The history of religion in all times is full of such instances. Thousands have rehearsed the Creed, its stupendous confession of the mystery of the Incarnation and the Holy Ghost, its articles of the Holy Catholic Church and the Communion of Saints, with but the faintest sense of all that such words carried with them.

And thus Israel acknowledged that the Lord was their King, that He was Lord of heaven and earth; acknowledged it, rebelling, sinning, repenting, relapsing, in His chastisements, in His forgiveness and redemption; acknowledged it with barren homage, with the feeling that God's election was the charter of their security and pride. But the time of enlargement came. One of those great instruments, chosen and raised up by God to be His interpreter and prophet, to say the things not said before, to open the eyes of men to sights not seen before, David, the shepherd, David, the king, David, the psalmist, rose, under God's teaching, to understand and to tell forth what is really meant by the "kingdom of God." And the thoughts of David multiplied, diversified, verified, expanded, by the experience and inspiration of a series of devout and holy singers, in the Book of Psalms, have taught all generations how to think and to feel about the nature and character of that everlasting kingdom.

Two things appear at once on the surface in this great interpretation of the idea of the "kingdom of God."

1. One is its moral purpose. The kingdom of God is, indeed, exhibited in the Psalms in all its magnificence, in all its breadth, over nature and man, over the stars of the sky and the cattle on a

thousand hills, and the young ravens that cry unto Him; over the storms of the desert and the water-floods; over the march of history and the destinies of nations, and the secrets of the heart of man; over all that vast inconceivable universe beyond the most distant star. Almost the first utterance of the Psalter is the tremendous warning against the rebellion of the mightiest powers on earth against the "Lord and His Anointed:"—"He that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh them to scorn; the Lord shall have them in derision." And the book closes with those exulting songs of joy and triumph at the splendours of God's kingdom, in the heights above and in the depths below, which seem more and more filled, every time we repeat them, with the strength and the "new wine"* of the Spirit of God. "I will magnify Thee, O God, my King; and I will praise Thy name for ever and ever. All Thy works praise Thee, O Lord; and Thy saints give thanks unto Thee. They show the glory of Thy kingdom, and talk of Thy power; that Thy power, Thy glory, and the mightiness of Thy kingdom might be known unto men." "O praise the Lord of heaven, praise Him in the height. Praise Him all ye angels of His: praise Him all His host. Praise Him, sun and moon: praise Him all ye stars and light. . . . . Praise the Lord upon earth, ye dragons and all deeps: fire and hail, snow and vapour, wind and storm fulfilling His word: mountains and all hills, fruitful trees and all cedars: beasts and all cattle, worms and feathered fowls. Young men and maidens, old men and children, praise the name of the Lord; for His name only is excellent, and His praise above heaven and earth." "Let everything that hath breath praise the Lord." Certainly the imagination of these inspired singers grasped, in all its fulness and glory, the outward and visible grandeur of the kingdom of God in heaven and earth. "O Lord our Governor, how excellent is Thy Name in all the world. Thou That hast set Thy glory above the heavens . . . for I will consider Thy heavens, even the works of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained." And not less wonderful did He seem to them in His doings towards the children of men, in the tokens of His power and judgment in the world, in the strange retrospect over the mysterious history of Israel. "Thy way is in the sea, and Thy paths in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known; Thou leddest Thy people like sheep by the hand of Moses and Aaron," "Thou art of more honour and might than the hills of the robbers; at Thy rebuke, O God of Jacob, both the chariot and horses are fallen." We know how such thoughts as these, about His kingdom in creation, in nature, in history, fill the souls of the psalmists. But the impressiveness of the awe and wonder with which they dwelt on what was outward and tangible makes all the more striking the clearness, the strength with which they discerned, amid all the might and majesty of God's everlasting dominion, amid all its beauty and all its terrors, the supreme and governing power of a moral purpose, of the law of righteousness and holiness and truth. That is the great and determining feature of the psalmists' varied portraiture of the kingdom of God. It is not merely the kingdom of God the Maker, and God the Ruler of all things; it is even more the kingdom of God in the closest and deepest relations with that moral world which He has called into being in the wills and consciences and affections of men. It is God the righteous Judge, God the Lover and Shield of goodness, God the Consoler, God the Guide, God the Teacher, God the Fountain of joy and gladness, God the Strength and Song of the true of heart, God the Forgiver, God the Healer, God the Helper and the Redeemer, God the compassionate, God the tender and the merciful—"Yea, like as a father pitieth his children, even so is the Lord merciful to them that fear Him"—this is He Whom the psalmists recognise and celebrate in the kingdom of God. Theirs is a conviction about that kingdom which, from the first Psalm to the last, knows no blessedness but the blessedness of righteousness, of innocence, of pardon. It is a kingdom far above man's power to influence, far above man's capacity to comprehend or measure, which is revealed to man only that he may understand that its law, "which never can be broken," more firm than the round world which cannot be moved, than the heavens so far above us, is the law which no change can touch, no might can alter, the eternal law of right and wrong. "The earth is the Lord's and all that therein is, the compass of the world and all that dwell therein. . . Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord, or who shall rise up in His holy place? Even he that hath clean hands and a pure heart, and that hath not lift up his mind unto vanity, nor sworn to deceive his neighbour." It is a kingdom in which, amid all its serenities of peace and glory, there is room and care for suffering, sinning, sorrowing man. Its King, "strong and patient," watches with strictest scrutiny, without respect of persons, all that men do, and all that men suffer. "His eyes consider the poor, and His eyelids try the children of men." He is a "Father of the fatherless, and defendeth the cause of the widows; even God in His holy habitation." He listens in terrible silence to the wrongs that are done on earth; and the Psalmists feel with certainty that He listens not in vain; that, sooner or later, His judgments will be manifest. He listens with pity and tender mercy to the humiliation of the sinner; the mysterious power of forgiveness and restoration is in His hands: there is mercy with Thee, therefore shalt Thou be feared. Such is the way in which the psalmists develop the idea

* Zech. ix. 17.

of the "kingdom of God."* They unite in one breath its awful wonder and surpassing glory, and with these its dominant, never absent moral aspects; its correspondence with man's conscience, his troubles, and wants, and fears, and hopes. Thus, time after time, the two are joined together. "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and Thy dominion endureth throughout all ages. The Lord upholdeth all such as fall, and lifteth up all those that are down." Again, "Who made heaven and earth, the sea, and all things therein; Who keepeth His promise for ever; Who helpeth them to right that suffer wrong; Who feedeth the hungry. . . . . The Lord looseth men out of prison; the Lord giveth sight to the blind. . . . . The Lord careth for the strangers, He defendeth the fatherless and widow." And once more, His merciful kindness is put side by side with the worlds which He has made: "He healeth those that are broken in heart, and giveth medicine to heal their sickness. He telleth the number of the stars, and calleth them all by their names." This is the characteristic of that Messianic kingdom, which is to realise it among men: "He shall keep the simple folk by their right, defend the children of the poor, and punish the wrong-doer. . . . . He shall be favourable to the simple and needy, and shall preserve the souls of the poor. He shall deliver their souls from falsehood and wrong, and dear shall their blood be in His sight."

2. The psalmists insist on the moral purpose of the "kingdom of God." What is equally noticeable is the breadth with which they assume and announce its universal character. For they were not insensible to the privileged position of the chosen people. They had all an Israelite's feelings that God dwelt and ruled in Israel as He did nowhere else; their hearts swelled at the remembrance of the greatness of their fortunes, at the pathetic vicissitudes of their most wonderful of histories: "The hill of Sion is a fair place, and the joy of the whole earth; on the north side lieth the city of the great King; God is well known in her palaces as a sure refuge." "In Jewry is God known, His name is great in Israel; at Salem is His tabernacle and His dwelling in Sion." "He showeth His word unto Jacob, His statutes and ordinances unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation, neither have the heathen knowledge of His laws." But though they were conscious of their own wonderful election, the heathen were not in their thoughts excluded from the kingdom and care of God. He, their "living Dread, who dwelt in Silo," or in Jerusalem, was yet the God of all the families of the earth, and for the blessing of all the families of the earth was the blessing given to Abraham and his seed. All that vast sea of nations, that surged around the narrow bounds of Israel, so utterly unlike it in language, in worship, in history, separated from it apparently as widely as if they were the inhabitants of another world, was yet swayed and ruled by the All-Holy Whom they worshipped. "It was He that nurtureth, or chastiseth the heathen," as He nurtured or chastised them; "it was He that teacheth man knowledge," whether among the chosen of Judah, or the strangers who had not learned to call on His name. They, the first-fruits, the firstborn of mankind, were but the leaders in the song of praise. "O sing praises, sing praises unto our God; sing praises, sing praises unto our King. For God is the King of all the earth; sing ye praises with understanding. God reigneth over the heathen, God sitteth upon His holy seat. The princes of the people are joined unto the people of the God of Abraham; for God which is very high exalted doth defend the earth as it were with a shield." We, in our age of the world, can hardly take in the real difficulty of this thought in those old days of local religions and national gods. It was as strange to the Egyptian or the Greek as to the Jew. Nowhere was it realised, except in the psalmists' high-raised thought; nothing looked like it to human experience or human judgment. But they never doubted. Surely it is as wonderful as it is certain, that in this obscure corner of the world, this little people, who but for after-events would be almost lost to history, dared to look forward through the darkness, and announce with unwavering faith, in the songs of their worship, the recognition by the Gentiles of the "kingdom of God." "Desire of me, and I shall give the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession." "Sing unto God, O ye kingdoms of the earth; O sing praises unto the Lord, Who sitteth in the heavens from the beginning; Lo, He doth send out His voice; yea, and that a mighty voice." "All nations whom Thou hast made shall come and worship Thee, O Lord; and shall glorify Thy name." "The heathen shall fear Thy name, O Lord, and the kings of the earth Thy majesty." "God be merciful to us and bless us, and show the light of His countenance, and be merciful unto us, that Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations. O let the nations rejoice and be glad, for Thou shalt judge the folk righteously and govern the nations upon earth." And so in the great Messianic prophecy of Him in Whom was to be gathered up the "kingdom of God." "His dominion shall be also from the one sea to the other, and from the flood unto the world's end. . . . . All kings shall fall down before Him, all nations shall do Him service. His name shall endure for ever; His name shall remain under the sun among the posterities which shall be blessed

* Lord of the world, Almighty King,
Thy shadow resteth over all,—
Or where the Saints Thy terrors sing,
Or where the waves obey Thy call.
—*Froudes' Remains.*

through Him, and all the heathen shall praise Him."

Such was the image of the "kingdom of God" as it presented itself to the imagination and the faith of those holy men of old. Such is the image which they impressed upon all religion; the image which rose before the mind of the prophets, never effaced, never forgotten, amid the blinding storms of ruin, in the degradation and bitterness of captivity. "Thou hast been a strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in his distress; a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall" (Is. xxv.). "When the poor and needy seek water and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I, the Lord, will hear them; I, the God of Israel, will not forsake them" (Is. xli.). "That they may know from the rising of the sun and from the west that there is none beside me: I am the Lord, and there is none else" (Is. xlv.). And such was that great preliminary truth which Jesus Christ came preaching when He began His ministry; the foundation of His appeal to the souls of men, the introduction to the deeper and special announcements of what He was to do and to tell us. My brethren, we too, are living in "the kingdom of God;" as individuals, as a Church, as a nation, that kingdom, in its awful righteousness, in its vastness beyond our thought and ken, is over us as in the days when the songs of the psalmists first revealed its wonders to the heart of man. Dimly, indeed, amid the darkness and troubles of the world, we trace its outlines; dimly can we follow the counsels which direct its course. But at least we can try to rise to the height of its greatness: we can catch something of its spirit from the inspired lips of those who have gone before us; we can try to be somewhat worthy of it. We can remember that it is not of to day or yesterday: it has its roots in what was before the ages, and it reaches beyond their end. Here we are shaken; here we are perplexed; here we are alarmed, perhaps, for what we hold most dear and most sacred. Here we see not our path, we miss our way, and the future rises up before us dark and ominous. Have such times never been before? Have not men asked before, "Hath God forgotten to be gracious, and will He shut up His loving-kindness in displeasure?" Ah! the answer to that question was not always what men liked and hoped: but the "kingdom of God" had *not* been turned out of its course, and God had *not* forgotten to be gracious. Oh, my brethren, Christians who have known the triumph of the cross of Jesus Christ, the triumph of His great defeat, let us not fail and shrink, as those who do not believe God's kingdom. If troubles seem to threaten, if troubles come, do not let us bear the mind that cowards bear—be downcast and unreasonable, and fretful, and violent, and unscrupulous. There is no more marked lesson in the Bible than the temper it enjoins for days of disquiet, it may be of pain and fear. Those were not easy days when an Apostle warned his disciples against losing their self-possession, their evenness of mind, and in the stress and hurry of alarm forgetting that their one safety and their one business was to think of pleasing God. "Therefore, we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace to serve God acceptedly (to well-pleasing), with reverence and godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire." Those were not quiet days—the storm was swelling fierce and loud—when the Psalmist faced the storm:—"God is our hope and strength; a very present help in trouble. Therefore will we not fear, though the earth be moved: and though the hills be carried into the midst of the sea. Though the waters thereof rage and swell, and though the mountains shake at the tempest of the same. The rivers of the flood thereof shall make glad the city of God: the holy place of the tabernacle of the Most Highest. God is in the midst of her, therefore shall she not be removed. God shall help her and that right early."

---

TABLE OF HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN FOR JANUARY.—3rd, Second Sunday after Christmas. Morning: 70, 59, 165. Evening: 71, 154, 229.—10th, First Sunday after Epiphany. Morning: 78, 75, 267. Evening: 399, 103, 21.—17th, Second Sunday after Epiphany. Morning: 77, 189, 220. Evening: 219, 169, 63.—24th, Third Sunday after Epiphany. Morning: 35, 462, 323. Evening: 79, 164, 20.—31st, Fourth Sunday after Epiphany. Morning, 80, 194, 305. Evening: 270, 252, 218.

DULVERTON CHURCH, which has received many embellishments during the incumbency of the present vicar, Prebendary Tilney Bassett, has recently been enriched with the completion of stained glass in all the windows throughout. The chancel was thus adorned a few years ago, and now the nave has been assimilated. The donor of the latter is G. Williams, Esq., and the artists Messrs. Lavers and Westlake.

WE are told that a number of members of Convocation have suggested to Archdeaeon Sumner that he would be very acceptable to the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury as Prolocutor; and we understand that he will be proposed for that office.

THE London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* says—"The statement that Dr. S. Simpson has resigned the office of succentor of St. Paul's Cathedral serves to remind one of a somewhat singular condition of affairs. It is, I think, very little known that the cathedral has a precentor (the Rev. C. A. Belli) whose salary is £1,000 a year, and who has held the office for over thirty years. He is reported to have very strong objections to choral services, and consequently takes small interest in the cathedral. It is said, indeed, that his last public appearance at St. Paul's dates as far back as the national thanksgiving day for the recovery of the Prince of Wales, and that he is personally unknown to the junior officials."

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 2, 1886.

## THE STUDY OF GERMAN.

IN his fourth volume of "Short Studies on Great Subjects," Mr. Froude says:—"I was thrown on my own resources, and began to read hard in modern history and literature. Carlyle's books came across me; by Carlyle I was led to Goethe. I discovered Lessing for myself, and then Neander and Schleiermacher." This passage bears testimony to the fact that it is chiefly owing to Carlyle that German studies in this country took their rise. Carlyle's essays in "Fraser's Magazine" from 1828 and onwards familiarized English readers to some extent with such German authors as Goethe, Schiller, Werder, Richter, and others. Upon the last mentioned of these authors Carlyle is believed to have founded his own peculiar English style, which, with its mingled elements of lurid tragedy, sulphurous gloom, and exaggerated comedy, is, in spite of its grotesqueness, a splendid possession of English literature. To Coleridge also is partially due the introduction into England of a taste for German literature, as he translated some of Schiller's plays, viz., "The Piccolomini" and "Wallenstein." Happily this has been a growing taste, and the number of English-speaking people who study German is rapidly increasing. German literature, though mainly the product of the present century, is a marvellous growth. If any of our readers will take the trouble to obtain from Messrs. Foster, Figgis & Co. their catalogue of German works, including periodical and newspaper literature, they will be astonished at its magnitude, if not already familiar with it. But as we are not writing in any very systematic way on the subject, we shall content ourselves with jotting down a few general thoughts. To a theologian a knowledge of German is exceedingly useful. Dr. Pusey studied the language in Germany; so did Dean Alford. The latter spent a month at Bonn with a tutor, working very hard ten hours a day, and confining himself to German society almost exclusively. His biographer speaks more glowingly of the success of this short period of study, or rather cramming, than the Dean did himself. She says, "He acquired a mastery over that language which, notwithstanding repeated attempts previously in England, he had failed to acquire, and which gave him for the rest of his life easy access to the vast stores of theological learning which German industry has accumulated." Alford's own estimate of the result of the month's cramming was much more modest. He said:—"I hope I have facility enough now to read *slowly* all the Commentaries I want." The reader of Liddon's "Bampton Lectures" is aware how many passages from German writers are quoted in that admirable work. How much anyone loses who must pass them by in ignorance! There is a general impression that German is a very difficult language, to which Mark Twain has largely contributed in his "Tramp Abroad." But its difficulties are a good deal exaggerated. No doubt some parts of the grammar, such as the use of separable verbs, and the declension of adjectives with the article, are very difficult at first; but we are convinced that anyone who has even moderately mastered Greek and Latin, will find German much easier. A fairly diligent student of moderate abilities will acquire a very useful working knowledge of German, including writing, speaking, and reading, not in a month, but in the space of two years, by merely using up spare time, unoccupied by other duties. Of course a teacher is taken for granted. Even if a man is engaged in regular professional work, we should advise him to make the attempt, and if he perseveres he will be amply repaid. Germans as a rule study English more than Englishmen study German, at least they seem to have done so hitherto, though the balance may now be beginning to be redressed. It is quite common to find many Germans, when you are travelling in Germany, who can speak English fairly well. To anyone fond of derivation, and the sources of English, a knowledge of German will open a new door of light and delight. And it is so much more gratifying to find these by one's own actual research than by studying ready-made lists of them, which, like all "index-learning," is seldom or never digested, and does not remain. Just like hand-books of "familiar quotations," which are really only crutches for literary cripples, and which any real scholar will fling away as mere aids to indolence and helps to humbug.

There is one objection to German theological literature familiar to us, that much of it is very rationalistic. This is quite true; the reputation of Strauss in this respect is a case in point. Another sceptic says of him:—

Strauss ist der Porphyrius unserer Zeit;

and he adds:—

Es sind in Deutschland die theologen die dem lieben Gott ein ende machen.

But a professional theologian might just as well refuse to study English sceptical literature as German; and it is said, and we believe with truth, that the works of Darwin and Herbert Spencer

have exerted a far greater influence on German thought than the works of any German rationalists have exerted upon English. Professor Ernest Haeckel, of the University of Jena, *e.g.*, is a most devoted disciple of Darwin, and goes so far as to anticipate "the happy results" which in his opinion the modern doctrine of Evolution will entail, when the true natural religion founded on reason takes the place of the dogmatic religion of the Church, and its leading principle derives the human sense of duty from the social instincts of animals. That is pretty well. But we have really little right to throw stones, for Laing's "Modern Science and Modern Thought" is as painful a specimen of recent English scepticism as one would wish *not* to see. We must also remember what we owe to orthodox Germans like Neander, Olshausen, and Hengstenberg, and bear in mind that if a man can keep his head in the midst of modern English infidelity, he has nothing more to fear from German. Should these observations induce any of our readers to take up a hitherto neglected field of study, they will have answered an excellent end.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### DISENDOWMENT.

SIR,—In the letter of "Presbyter" in your to-day's paper, he says that Disestablishment and Disendowment are not matters of right and wrong. He is correct as to the first, incorrect as to the second.

It is matter not of morality, but of expedience (that is, it is a question as to the properest means to a proper end), whether the present relations of the Crown and the Parliament to the Church shall be maintained as they are or altered; and should it be resolved to alter those relations, the terms of the new relations will be questions of the best means to the designed ends It may come to be the opinion of the operative majority of British subjects that it shall be right to substitute election of rectors, &c., by parishioners for the present various modes of appointing those ministers; and it may come to be their opinion that the House of Lords would be improved in quality by the expulsion of the Bishops. I am not going to discuss those points; merely, for fear of future mistakes, I desire to say that I am very decidedly of opinion that the above-described kind of reform is not real improvement.

This is Disestablishment. "Disendowment" (I place the word in inverted commas to signify that it is really no better than a phrase of slang) is totally different. The Church of this country in its various parts is not "endowed" with its property in any manner or sense differently from the manner or sense in which the Duke of Westminster is "endowed" with his property, you with your watch, I with my hat. Church property is the property of the Church, under the various express trusts, when there are any, which describe the conditions, and all, generally, under the essential condition that it shall be administered for the Church's purposes. The Church is not a corporation in the ordinary legal sense of the word, it is rather, in the eye of the law (*vide* Mr. Gladstone's speech introducing Irish Church Bill), an aggregate of corporations; but it is, in reality, a society, or union, of persons for a common object. As such, it has the same right (not an analogous right, but the same) to hold property unmolested as the various persons composing it have to hold their own individual properties unmolested, that is, so long as they do not forfeit them through crime, when, as a matter of course, being unfit to enjoy any civil rights, they are deprived, at the same time as of their liberty, of their property.

This being the case, there is no right (using the term in its moral sense, and not as legal right or power merely) on the part of Parliament to assume to any new corporation or commission, or to the Crown, the properties of the Christian Society of these countries. That society holds its estates under the same titles as private persons hold theirs, and, it being the duty of the civil government to protect them in the enjoyment of those estates, it is equally its duty to protect the Church in the enjoyment of its estates. The same duty is owed by the State to the various Nonconformist communities, most (or all) of which hold their properties indirectly or through the medium of trustees, similarly to the Established Church.

It is said by some (and believed by many, although by none who are intelligently acquainted with the facts relating to this mass of Church property, *vide* Mr. E. A. Freeman's pamphlet) that it is not really the property of a society, but is the property of the Commonwealth, and has been confided to the society or its trustees for certain purposes, and that it is competent (meaning morally competent) to the Commonwealth to "resume" that property at its option. Sometimes this statement of the State's right is mixed up with a kind of indictment of the Church as to its conduct in the administration of its trust or trusts, suggesting that if a better use could be made of the estates by some other application, it is actually the duty of the State to take them away from the hitherto steward. Much use has been made in setting forward this view, or set of notions, of the constant application of the term "National" to the Church of England. It is represented that if the Church be "national," or belonging to the nation, surely its property must also so belong, and that the nation has a right to do as it will with its own. I notice this only to instance a very common play upon words, as easy as common when people neither define them, nor look in a dictionary for what they mean, nor think of what they mean. The Church is "national," therefore its property is the property of the nation. It would be as reasonable to say beer is the national beverage, and, therefore, all the breweries at Burton-on-Trent are national property. All persons, without exception, who are in even a moderate degree acquainted with the history of Church property and of the Church, know that what it possesses is all, in the view of our law, which in this, as in most cases, views facts correctly, the property of the sundry ecclesiastical trustees as much as, and in the same sense as, private trustees' property is theirs. All the fables that are being spread to the contrary of this are new and false, invented probably by some crotcheteer with the common mixture proper to that kind of person of ingenuity and absurdity, repeated by ignorant persons taken with novelty, and

urged by enemies, some of them dishonest and malignant, of the Christian Society in these kingdoms.

I do not feel at liberty, considering your comparatively small space, to go further than merely state the heads of this question—not that there is any question to those who know or think (how few do that!) at all about it. What I should desire your intelligent correspondent, "Presbyter," to understand, is, that "Disestablishment" is one thing, and "Disendowment" another thing, and that there is no connection between them, except what is accidental, and nothing common between them whatever.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

26th December, 1885.

P.S.—You have a letter from Rev. C. J. Buchanan about the state of the Irish Church. He thinks that Church is in a bad way because sixty-seven churches have been shut up. It is said there are a great many churches that ought to be shut up in the City of London. Suppose this were done, would Mr. Buchanan pronounce the Church of England in a bad way? I know a good deal of the Church of Ireland, and I am very clear when I assure your correspondent that it is in a much better condition than the "state" of Ireland. Mr. Buchanan says also, that Lord Beaconsfield gave as a reason for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, that it had been unfaithful to its trust. Until I see this in Hansard, I must think your correspondent has quoted some one else by mistake. Lord Beaconsfield was not in the habit of talking nonsense. If, one hundred and seventy years ago, when Jonathan Swift, and the scum of the English Clergy, shot upon Ireland like rubbish, whom he described, were alive, the Church of Ireland had been so accused, there might have been reason; not in that generation when it was served by a very painstaking and meritorious clergy, very passably learned, and superior, I say with confidence, to the average of the English clergy. Had the Church of Ireland continued to serve the partizan requirements of English statesmen as it did at one time, probably it would have been let alone.

I have recently looked over some of the discussions at the time of the Irish Church Bill, and recognize with much interest the same kind of reasoning (if it be reasoning) for the displacement of that Church from its position, and for the stealing of its property, that is now being urged in respect to the Church of England. Nearly all of the considerations that were advanced were false, in law and in logic, I need not say in morals also; and I have little doubt that much of them was put forward with malice and in dishonesty.

## JAMES v. 11.

SIR,—I feel so strong a sympathy with every honest effort to promote a right understanding of Scripture, that I venture through you to offer my thanks to Mr. Murphy for his careful discussion of the passage named above. Interested, however, not convinced, is the present attitude of my mind, and I think that I shall best show my appreciation of his argument by endeavouring to point out briefly where it seems to me to be weak.

In approaching the passage we are bound to bear in mind the invariable connection between *patience* and *hope*, which is found in all the Epistles written before the great coming of the Lord, to which the primitive Christians looked forward; His coming, I mean, to abolish the old dispensation, and establish His kingdom in its place. Trials and sufferings were never contemplated alone; they were always viewed in the light of the coming reward and glory. Why be patient under them, and more than patient? Why despise them, and ever rejoice in them? Because they were but the short prelude to the triumph, the recompense, the salvation, which the Lord would speedily bring. This is the language of St. Paul, St. Peter, and of the writer to the Hebrews. Everywhere patience is sustained by the thought of the hope to be fulfilled, and the grace or salvation to be brought, at the revelation of Jesus Christ. And this is the thought of St. James also: "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he hath been approved, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love Him." "Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord is at hand."

With this Apostolic ground of patience present to his mind, St. James selects from the ancient Scriptures, as familiar to the persons whom he addresses, a biographical example to enforce it, an example in which patient endurance was crowned by a signal recompense. "Of Job's patience ye have heard," he writes, "and the Lord's issue ye have seen, showing that the Lord is full of pity and merciful." Is not the thought most natural that St. James is here connecting Job's trial with its blessed result, as illustrating the dealings of the Lord with His suffering people, and furnishing a corroboration of their hope? The issue of the suffering in the blessedness is the very point needed to enforce the exhortation. To mention the suffering and the patience alone would not have answered the purpose; it was the bright end to which they led that was required to stimulate hope, and as this was ready to hand in the example, surely the writer could hardly have omitted to refer to it, and thus have left his exhortation comparatively pointless!

Besides, on the other view, the sufferings of Christ also are referred to, without any reference to their issue in His glorification. This is not the Apostolic method in a similar connection. "If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him." "Run with patience, looking unto Jesus, who for the joy set before Him endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, that when His glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy." The topic of Christ's patience is a real stimulus to our patience only when the issue of His sufferings in His glory is taken into account. To limit oneself to saying to the sufferer, "You have seen Christ's end," meaning "His agony and bloody sweat, His Cross and passion," strikes me as exceedingly flat and unsatisfactory.

Against the common interpretation Mr. Murphy adduces but a single argument, which is that between "ye have *heard*" and "ye have *seen*" there is an emphatic contrast, making it almost certain that the latter phrase refers to something which St. James's readers had seen with their own eyes. Not to mention that at a distance of some thirty years from the Crucifixion very few of the living members of the Dispersion were likely to have been eye-witnesses of that event; neither phrase is emphatic at all. The emphasis is on "Job's patience," and "the Lord's issue." And I fancy that a reason may be given for the change from "hear" to "see," besides that of

avoiding a repetition of the same word. The word for *end* or *issue* carries with it a theological sense, a hint of a purpose preparing and directing the issue, and finding its accomplishment in it. To recognise this underlying purpose an act of intellectual perception is necessary, and to express that act the verb "to hear" is unsuitable, and one denoting an exercise of the perceptive faculty is required. This we have in the other verb, which denotes mental as well as corporeal perception.

May I trespass on your space to add one more remark? The inference drawn by St. James is that "the Lord is full of pity and merciful." Now this is not the natural inference from Christ's sufferings. The lesson stamped upon them, taken as it is supposed here by themselves, is His humility (see Philip. ii. 5-10). Nor can it be drawn from Job's sufferings; rather the contrary is what they suggest. It is only when that divine purpose of vindicating Job, and crowning his patient endurance with a double blessing, is taken into account, that the lesson comes out, and we see that the Lord who suffered him to be chastened was working all through the strange trial in tender mercy and grace. To my mind this alone is decisive against the reference of "the end of the Lord" to the Passion of Christ.

PRESBYTER.

## "ECCE ITERUM CRISPINUS."

SIR,—I have read the letter of "V.G." in your last, which I take to be that of the "V.G. of Kildare," and far from my glorying, as he supposes, in so many churches being closed in Ireland, I regret it exceedingly; and then with regard to "An Irish Clergyman of Twenty Years' Standing and in the same Diocese," who still declines to give his name, I would say:—I never said the Irish Church was going down, because so many churches have been closed. My object in having mentioned the matter at all, in my sermon, was as a caution to those at this side, not to do likewise; and perhaps (as I have no doubt would be the case) many more churches would be closed, than even in Ireland. I am found fault with for leaving the Irish Church. I would never have done so had my services been valued, and had I been given suitable preferment, but I have found more kindness, more attention, from English clergy, than ever I did in Ireland, and I may say the same of the gentry. My services have been valued over here, and much better remunerated than ever they were in Ireland; although the work is harder, it is pleasanter, and not (as I fear work in Ireland is) intended to please any party. If the writer of the letter, which seems to come from the Diocese of Armagh and Clogher, would procure for me as suitable work in Ireland as I have here, and remuneration accordingly, I have not the least objection to again cast in my lot with the Irish Church, and devote my well earned experience of thirteen or fourteen years on this side of the water for her benefit, but I fear I would never find the same liberality and kindness in Ireland as I have in England; still I am willing to abide by what I have said, and am open to an offer. I wish well to the Irish Church, and am only sorry the G. O. M. deprived her of her position, and sincerely hope he may not do the same to the English Church, which would be more disastrous in the long run than what happened to the Church of Ireland. She has done wonders since then, and I do hope there will be nothing in the coming political crisis to cripple her resources in the least, and that she may go on in the future as she has in the past; to prosper and be a blessing to the land of my birth, and in whose bosom I derived all my spiritual advantages, and was permitted for a short time to act as one of her unworthy ministers.

C. T. BUCHANAN.

St. Stephen's Day, 1885.

## THE STATUTE LAW CONCERNING AFFINITIES.

SIR,—Mr. Cole having stated in your impression of the 19th December that the statutes of Henry VIII. which prohibit marriage with a deceased wife's sister, were repealed by 1 Elizabeth, c. 1, I must trouble you with a word on this subject.

If your readers will refer to the case of Brook *v.* Brook, decided by the House of Lords on the 18th of March, 1861, they will find that Lords Campbell, Cranworth, St. Leonards, and Wensleydale all expressly held that those statutes were not repealed as regards the prohibition within the Levitical degrees, but were "clearly in force"; and on these grounds they ruled the marriage in question to be illegal and void, as being "not only prohibited by our law, but prohibited because it was contrary to the Law of God."

TEXT.

## KINDNESS TO ANIMALS.

SIR,—May I trouble you with an answer to certain considerations anent our duty to animals, or rather the non-existence of any moral duty towards the brute creation, put forward by Mr. Philip Austin in a pamphlet published by Mr. Kegan Paul. As Mr. Austin gives his name to authenticate his sentiments, I think I ought to give mine, as I can only acquit him of extraordinary hardness of heart on the plea of invincible prejudice, or of bondage to a vile tradition. Mr. Austin, namely, maintains that "animals have, in themselves, no more rights than plants or stones,"—that is to say, none whatever. He goes on to say, *totidem verbis*, "that the infliction of pain upon them is perfectly indifferent in itself," and to establish this thesis Mr. Austin adduces all manner of stoical precepts from the most severe fathers of the Church (and the tender mercies of Jerome and his like are very cruelty), and even does not scruple to claim our Lord Himself as being wholly indifferent to animal life or death, because He suffered the evil spirits to enter into the swine, for the punishment of those who set at nought the law of Moses in keeping them.

It is difficult to treat such an argument as this with ordinary patience. Our Divine Master expressed His love for the creatures when He said, "Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them." And again: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall to the ground without your Father." Indeed, if Mr. Austin were not able to adduce a fearful *catena* of authorities in support of what I must venture to call his hideous blasphemies—for he accuses God the Father and Christ the Lord of his own grievous inhu-

manity—one would be tempted to think this pamphlet written by way of sport, and suppose that no sane man could advocate such views. But the truth is that one extreme engenders another. Humanitarians, starting from the thesis that deliberate and prolonged agonies ought not to be inflicted on the brute creation, have gone on to protest against all sport, and have raised such a tempest of indignation in Mr. Austin's breast, that he has exploded in this deliberate attempt to prove that indifference to creature-suffering is a mark of Christian orthodoxy! No regulation of the Mosaic law, according to him, marks any tenderness for animals; not even, I suppose, the merciful precept, not "to seethe a kid in his mother's milk," and the many kindred injunctions which are all in strict keeping with the inspired text: "The righteous man regardeth the life of his beast, but the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel." Has Mr. Austin forgotten the touching words which close the Book of Jonah? "Should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand, *and also much cattle?*" Mr. Austin informs us, following therein the unhappy teaching of Whewell, that animals, having no duties to perform, can have no rights. But they have duties to perform to their mates and to their young, and, in the case of domesticated creatures, to their masters also. He quotes the certainly unfortunate query of St. Paul, *à propos* of the merciful Old Testament injunction, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." "Doth God take care for oxen?" To which I would answer most emphatically, "Yes, He does take care." "Or saith He it altogether for our sake." To which I would answer as emphatically, "Most certainly not!" This is an instance of that argumentative and passionate zeal which at times disturbs the generally clear judgment of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, making him in this instance prefer a mere deduction of his own, however reasonable, to a divine precept. But is it not the same St. Paul who has told us that the whole brute creation suffers not willingly or by any fault of its own, but by the will of Him (Almighty God), who hath subjected the same in hope that (in some mysterious sense) the creature itself should be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God? I make my appeal plainly, then, from the worse to the better mind of the great Apostle. He himself has admitted that he was not always equally taught of God, and I must discern the presence of a marked human element in the midst of the divine. Bad reasoning is not inspired, nor is bad grammar. In St. Paul I hail one of the greatest—perhaps the greatest—of theologians or of God-inspired men, the bold proclaimer of a God of Love, WHO IS THE SAVIOUR OF ALL MEN, not potentially or in intention only and desire, but in very act and deed; but I cannot place the comparatively uninspired and human 1st Epistle to the Corinthians (*e.g.*) on a footing with that expression of ripened wisdom and all-embracing charity, the 1st Epistle to Timothy. But this is a digression. Regarded as a whole, Old and New Testament alike bear testimony to the duty of humanity to the creatures, and breathe the spirit of love to man and to the brute creation. God is love, and He has pledged His word that evil shall be swallowed up of good, that death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed, and that God shall be all in all, and both in the Old and New Testaments, in mystic prophecy in Isaiah and the Book of Revelation, He has taught us to hope that the suffering brute creation shall partake in universal joy. "Behold I make all things new."

It is a natural mark of the great Apostasy, the terrible falling away of the third, fourth, and following centuries, that the duty of love to the creatures should thus be questioned and denied. How should those who believed in a God of hate, a God who brought innumerable human souls into existence, foreseeing that the use they would make of their liberty would be to doom themselves to never-ending hell?—how should men, who believed in what I do not scruple to call a cruel and inhuman God, a very Moloch, discern the duty of love to the brute creation? They lived and breathed in an atmosphere of odious, selfish religionism, hateful to God and man! Their unhappy gnosticism blighted all life, and plunged the crushed world into an all but bottomless pit of ruin. It is a part of this odious tradition, as Mr. Austin plainly shows, to be absolutely indifferent to the sufferings of the brute creation, and this is the special mark for evil of Latin Christianity to this hour. In truth, the pamphlet on which I am commenting is the work of a bigot, but belief in the endlessness of human sin and misery, that heresy of heresies and lie of lies, which puts the devil on the throne of God, is logically consistent only with cruelty to man and beast. He who loves God aright will love all His creatures, even the weakest, and pity the most vile. Of course man may slay the brutes, may fish, shoot, hunt,—but not deliberately torture. As Mr. Austin has thought himself justified in expressing his whole mind, I have thought it well to be as frank as he.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford.

## CHILDREN'S CONVALESCENT HOMES.

SIR,—Although the cause of Convalescent Homes is very seldom pleaded in the winter, we wish to appeal now to your readers for help to carry on our two Homes, one at Ramsgate for twelve boys, and one at Broadwater for twenty-six girls. It is desirable that both of these Homes should be kept open during the winter, as the change of air is almost equally beneficent during these months, and we cannot accommodate all our numerous applicants in the summer season. Expenses therefore continue all the year round, and we feel the burden of them heaviest just now when people are least thinking of the necessity of a sea-side trip, and least willing to open their hearts and purses to us. These homes are open to all comers, if properly recommended and medically suitable, and cases of slow convalescence are frequently kept for six weeks or two months. The railway fare must be paid by the parents or recommenders; the weekly payment is decided by the committee according to circumstances. We have good Christian matrons, and have obtained very happy results so far, both as regards the bodily and spiritual welfare of the children. We, therefore, confident in the goodness of the cause, ask for assistance to tide us over the next few months, and subscriptions or donations will be gratefully received by the undersigned,

E. A. GLADSTONE.
AULAY MACAULAY.

The Mission Room,
Blechynden Street, Notting Hill, Dec. 22, 1885.

## Reviews and Notices.

"Mr. Gladstone: A Retrospect and a Prospect." By George Anthony Denison, Vicar of East Brent and Archdeacon of Taunton. London: William Ridgway, 1885. Pp. 48.

This we consider a very opportune and useful little brochure, and we trust that it will encourage some members of the new House of Commons to expose the numerous inconsistencies, tergiversations, and gross immoralities of the present demagogic misleader of the nation. It fully confirms all that we have written of him and his doings during the last five years, and if it induces practical politicians and business men to lift up their voices against the untruthfulness, deceptions, and immoralities of Mr. Gladstone, it will have rendered an essential service to the British Empire. We hold by the Apostolic injunction of distrusting a man in public affairs who has proved himself incapable of successfully managing his own private affairs. The Archdeacon confesses to sundry inconsistencies in his own conduct—a very grave fault in a public man. Some of his strictures on Mr. Gladstone may be thought somewhat severe, but they are frequently vouched for by others. Here are a few extracts from the book, culled at random :—

### The Prince of Opportunists.

Mr. Gladstone is the Prince of "Opportunists;" watching and waiting for every opportunity of adding to the strength of "the great Liberal party" in the House of Commons, whatever be the nature, character, occasion of the opportunity. If any number of Bradlaughs present themselves to take the oath, Mr. Gladstone, having written over the door of the House of Commons, "Civil and Irreligious Liberty," is bound to be the first to open the door, to usher and welcome in. Are they not an important section of "the great Liberal Party"?

### "Hold Hard—I'm not Ready."

Mr. Gladstone, again, is not satisfied with paving the way by present deprecation for severance of State from Church in another Parliament. He fills up the interval with such things as "marriage with a deceased wife's sister," a thing in itself, and in its necessary adjuncts and followings, the breaking up by law of the land of all sanctity and purity of marriage.

Mr. Gladstone, the nominal leader of "the great Liberal party," says to frightened Whigs for their consolation, and to Red Radicals for their encouragement—in Manifesto espousing both sides of the question, *more suo*—"Hold hard—I'm not ready! Not 'just at present.' Your time will come—don't be in such a hurry, or you will dislocate and break into little bits 'the great Liberal party,' of which, as I have told you before, 'the Nonconformist is the backbone.' Take your time. It is an 'open question.'" Mr. Gladstone is the Prince of Opportunists. Now an "Opportunist" means a man who is intent, above all other things, upon carrying out his "opportunity." This is his mania; he will sacrifice everything else to compass it—whether the thing he wants opportunity for be good or bad for his country. This comes in, if at all, as the second and inferior consideration.

He wants something for his party—that is, for "the great Liberal party," for an "Opportunist" is always a "Liberal"—and watches his opportunity. If this comes suddenly, it sweeps him along without allowing him a moment to pause and consider what it is he is about. For Opportunism possesses this inherent power of making its disciple sacrifice everything to the joy of a *coup d'état*.

### "He Will Never Go Straight."

One night in 1832, I was at Cuddesdon, talking to Saunders (afterwards Dean of Peterborough), over his pupils. At last we came to Gladstone, who had just got his double first-class. I said to Saunders, "Now, old man, there is one left I want to know something about, Gladstone; and then I'll go to bed, for I shall have had from you as much to digest as will serve me for some time about all these men." He said, "I'll tell you about Gladstone in a minute." I said, "What is it, then?" He said, "His conscience is so tender he will never go straight." I heard, and wondered. At first I could not take it in. It is now fifty-three years ago. I learnt by degrees to apprehend by manifold experiences all that the words meant.

### "I Think I Must Give up Gladstone."

Somewhere about 1860 I was talking with my neighbour and friend Lake, now Dean of Durham. I had not mentioned Gladstone's name to him. I never did, because naturally I felt sure we should not agree. All on a sudden he said, "I say, Denison, I think I must give up Gladstone." I said, "What, '*Et Tu Brute*'—mind, I did not begin this, but as you have begun it, may I ask why?" He said, "I think his intellect can persuade his conscience of anything." "Dear me," I said to myself, "that is what Saunders had prospectively in his mind when he said, 'His conscience is so tender, he will never go straight.' He was speaking of the boy and his young mind before it got into the struggle and conflicting influences of public life. Lake is speaking of the public man so well known. So changed from his early political belief. So uncertain as I have found him myself. How curious it all is. I must know more about it."

### "He Never had a Conscience."

So I sent Saunders's words and Lake's to my brother Stephen. He wrote back: "Very good stories and very true; but not all the truth." I asked, "What is all the truth?" He wrote: "*He* (Gladstone) *never had a conscience.*" "Well," I replied, "My dear Stephen, this is strange enough, you nearly quarrelled with me for trying to turn out Gladstone, you subscribed largely to his fund; and now you tell me he never had a conscience." "Oh," he said, "don't misapprehend me. I am saying nothing against his moral character." "Ah," said I, "When a man says of another, 'he never had a conscience,' it is commonly thought he is saying something that way." "No," he replied, "I mean nothing of the kind; what I mean is that he never had so much as one intuition to begin with. I have known him very well, nobody better, and I say that in every matter, little or big, which his mind rests upon, he is always marshalling the pros and the cons and building up conclusions which he is just as likely as not to pull down the next or the same day."

### The late Bishop Wordsworth and Mr Gladstone.

Not long after this, I was coming down by G.W R.

with my dear friend the late Bishop of Lincoln, Christopher Wordsworth. Something brought up Gladstone. We were alone in the carriage, and I told him my three stories. "Ah," he said, "this is very curious—you should write it all down." "Yes," I said, "I have it all in my mind, but I will write it all down." He went on—"What made me think it especially curious is that some few weeks ago I had a long talk with Gladstone myself in London. I told him how sadly he had disappointed us. That we had looked to him to fight the battle of the Church in the House of Commons, irrespective of power and place, and he had not done it in any particular. I enumerated several. He listened very patiently, and made me two very remarkable replies:—1. 'My dear Bishop, what is the use of my talking about these things to *five hundred Brahmins* in the House of Commons?' 2. 'All the points you have specified, and others like them, are intuitions to you, and men like you, who have sucked them in with their mother's milk. They are your foundation, that upon which you build. My case, let me say, is a different case. I was born and bred in an uninfluenced habit of life; and in my case every one of these things is the produce of the working of my own mind simply.'" Here observe he clenched, by his own admission, what has been said about his order and habit of mind in this publication. I am told that Bonamy Price, no mean judge of men, has said of Gladstone, "You know he has not one intuition."

### "Opposite Truths are *the* Truth."

In a letter from Lord Beaconsfield, when he was Mr. Disraeli, he says:—"My dear Archdeacon,—A fanatic is a dangerous man, and when he is first Minister and leader of the House of Commons, much more dangerous. It is true of Gladstone what Gerald Hamilton said of Burke, that his intellect is so profound, and his imagination so prolific, that he can, six times in every twenty-four hours, maintain that opposite truths are *the* truth, and the only truth." Well, I wrote in reply, "I don't know that I could have put it as well as you have, but it is the conclusion at which I have arrived long ago from abundant evidence."

### "William Knows He is the only Man that can Govern England."

One evidence remains. Some five years ago I was sitting with a dear friend and his wife, a man highly honoured among us down here. He said to me, "Denison, you know more about Gladstone than anybody else." "Yes," I said, "I think I do." "Well, tell me about him. He is a dear old friend, and I used to go after him once. Gave that up long ago. But now I not only cannot go with him, but I cannot understand him a bit." I said, poaching upon dear old Saunders, "I'll tell you all about Gladstone in a minute. Gladstone has persuaded himself that he is the only man that can govern England." He started in his chair. "What makes you start so?" I said. "Why it is curious. It is very little time ago that I put to Mrs. Gladstone the same question I have put to you, and she said, 'Oh, William knows he is the only man who can govern England.'" "Well," I said, "you may be sure I did not get my inspiration from Mrs. Gladstone, but you see we are at one upon the point."

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Catton, Rev. James W., Rector of Norton Malreward, Pensford, Bristol; Rector of St. Paul's, New Cross, Manchester.
Cochrane, Rev. D. C., Rector of Dalbury.
Coleman, Rev. Alfred Sansom, M.A., Curate of New Clee; Vicar of Fleckney.
Elliott, Rev. T. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Devonport; Vicar of St. Paul's, Tavistock.
Farquhar, Rev. George Taylor Shilleto, M.A., Assistant-Priest; Canon Reisdentiary and Precentor of St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth.
Garry, Rev. Wllliam Walker, the Missions to Seamen's Chaplain, Newport, Monmouth.
Harry, Rev. Ifan Llewellin, Curate of the Immanuel Church, Barlow Moor Lane, Didsbury; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Coldhurst, Oldham.
Hawkins, Rev. W. W., M.A., Vicar of Hensall-cum-Heck; Rector of Hinderclay, Suffolk.
Hume, Rev. Henry Sykes, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Wilton.
Jellicoe, Rev. G. S., M.A., Vicar of Alton St. Pancras, Dorsetshire.
Jobson, Rev. Edward, Vicar of St. Mark's, Heyside, Oldham; Vicar of Brierfield.
Knocker, Rev. Walter Geary, M.A., Rector of Oughtrington.
Lewis, Rev Alfred Merlin, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Ash-Martock.
Macdona, Rev. W., Vicar of Stockingford; Vicar of St. Mark's, Heyside.
Maclear, Rev. G. F., D D., Warden of St. Augustine's College; Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.
Marshall, Rev. W., Rector of St. Paul's, New Cross, Manchester; Rector of Norton Malreward, near Pensford, Bristol.
Rogers, Rev. H. G., late Vicar of Cranborne; Vicar of St. Thomas's, Salisbury.
Rorison, Rev. Vincent Lewis, M.A., Incumbent of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Forfar; Provost of St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth.
Scott, Rev. J. J., Senior Diocesan Inspector for Manchester; Rector of St. Clement's, Ordsal, Salford.
Shepherd, Rev. Alfred John Parkman, M.A., Rector of Upton Scudamore, Wilts.
Smith, Rev. Samuel, Rector of Kingsdown-with-Mappiscombe.
Thompson, Rev. Ralph Percy, B.A., Vicar of Cranborne.
Ward, Rev. H. Marlow, Itiaerant Missionary in the Diocese of British Honduras; Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, Belize, British Honduras.
Wilson, Rev. William, M. A., Rector of Narberth; Rector of Stoke Bruerne, Northamptonshire.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blomfield, Rev. George Becher, formerly Rector of Stevenage, and late Canon and Vice-Dean of Chester Cathedral, at Mollington Hall, Chester, on the 25th ult., aged 84.

Brogden, Rev. Arthur John, Rector of Hinxworth, Herts, only son of the late John Brogden. Esq., jun., of Ulverston, at Brook Street, London, on Christmas Day, aged 31.

Conder, Rev. John, LL.D., Chaplain of the South American Missionary Society, formerly Vicar of Wendy, near Cambridge, at Fray Bentos, Uruguay, on Nov. 25th, aged 48.

Ellis, Rev. Robert, B.D., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, at 3, Hlgher Summerlands, Exeter, on the 20th ult., aged 65.

Golightly, Rev. Charles Portales, formerly of Holywell Street, Oxford, on Christmas Day, after a short and nearly painless illness, in his 80th year.

Lascelles, Rev. Herbert, late Chaplain of Bengal Establishment, at Brighton, on the 7th ult., aged 75.

Stainforth, Rev. Richard, late Rector of Wheldrake, Yorkshire, at Woodhill, Torquay, on the 23rd ult., aged 82.

Tress-Beale, Rev. S. C., M.A., Oxon, the first Vicar of St. Michael's, Tenterden, at Eastgate, Tenterden, Kent, on the 23rd ult., aged 53.

Turing, Rev. J. R., M.A., late Vicar of Edwinstowe, at 2, Westfield, Bedford, on St. John's Day, Dec. 27, aged 60.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—II.

By the Very Rev. R. W. CHURCH, M.A., Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday, December 13th, 1885.

"Now, after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God."—St. Mark i. 14.

THE "kingdom of God" was one of the chief subjects of that inspired interpretation of the facts of human life in the Old Testament, which we call prophecy. It was the faith, the joy, the hope of the psalmists, and of those great teachers and witnesses of righteousness who came after them. And in the idea of it which possessed the minds of the psalmists and prophets we have two leading features. They thought of it, above all its wonder and greatness, as directed to a moral end and governed by a moral purpose; and, though they connected its presence specially with the history and fortunes of their own chosen race, they conceived of it as a universal kingdom; they extended it, without hesitation or doubt, in its judgments and its hopes, to all the families of mankind. Though the heathen knew not God, though at this or that moment they might be the enemies and oppressors of His people, they, too, were not without their interest in the blessing of Abraham, for they were the creatures of Him Who had said, "All souls are Mine." "The Lord is King, the earth may be glad thereof; yea, the multitude of the isles may be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about Him: righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His seat." "Tell it out among the heathen that the Lord is King, and that it is He Who hath made the round world so fast that it cannot be moved; and how that He shall judge the people righteously." I need not remind you that, open where you will, psalm or prophet, you will find such words as these. When St. Paul wrote, "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him," he said what sounded very strange to Jewish narrowness; but he said no more than he had learned from the Old Testament, than he found loudly proclaimed by David and Isaiah.

It was plain to St. Paul, but to the society in which St. Paul had been brought up it was unmeaning. Such words lay undeveloped in men's minds, listened to, familiar, but unrealised, unnoticed in their eventful significance till the process of time cleared them up, and disclosed the import with which they are charged. That, of course, which at last fulfilled their meaning, which brought these words again with fresh force and point into men's memories and hopes, was the coming of Him, for Whom psalmist and prophet had been so long preparing. Then, as indeed, could not but be, the idea, the belief, of the kingdom of God received a light it never had before, and presented new aspects which belonged to that great unveiling of the thoughts of God. For He was among us Who was King in that kingdom. From Him the world was to know, in parable or direct speech, what were the mysteries, the secrets, the laws of the kingdom of God, of which for ages men had heard so much. From Him men were to know all that was to be made known under the conditions of time and sight, of that invisible and everlasting rule which reaches from end to end, and orders and governs all things. With Him it was a favourite and characteristic expression: He has enshrined it in the Prayer of prayers: it stood, in His use of it, for all that He brought with Him, of mercy, of blessing, of light; of grace here, and of perfectness afterwards. For all were streams flowing from one fountain; all were administrations, powers, creations, presences, influences, of one supreme sovereignty, the kingdom of the God of righteousness, holiness, and love.

Taking the idea as a whole, with special reference to the aspects of it presented in the Old Testament and the New, we may ask what is added by the later to the earlier conceptions of it. And in the New Testament it seems that, while the old features, its supreme moral end, its universality, are retained and emphasised, it becomes at once more definite and tangible, and at the same time more removed to a sphere beyond human experience than it was to the thoughts of the Jewish prophets. For to us it is embodied in the person of the King Himself; that most awful of Beings has been with men; He bears a human name. And, on the other hand, all that this world knows of the proofs of greatness and power has nothing to do with Him. What was shown to the eye of flesh of Him who "sits on the throne judging right," was the "form of a servant," and the helplessness of the Crucified. He was indeed victorious, with such a victory as human life had never yet seen; victorious over sin, over death, over the hearts of men; but it was not shown on the scene where earthly success shows its triumph and glory. To the last that the world saw of Him, He was the "despised and rejected of men." Strange contrast to the forecast of Messianic prophecy—"Thou art fairer than the children of men, full of grace are Thy lips;" yet another prophecy had warned us what this would

ook like to all outward appearance: "He hath no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see Him there is no beauty that we should desire Him." And as with the King, so with the kingdom. The world was to see it, and to feel it, as the kingdom of God had never been felt before; yet who could say for certain, "Here is its presence, here is its supremacy"? Evangelist and Apostle never doubt that the "kingdom of God" is indeed "come with power;" they know that it enshrines and makes certain all that man ever hoped for; they feel that they are *in* it and *of* it, fulfilling its tasks, spreading abroad the news of its wonders, wakening up hearts and consciences to discern its tokens. But, as we well know, they go off from the Old Testament idea of a "kingdom" and power acknowledged upon earth, compelling recognition by visible greatness. All thought of outward greatness has passed into the background in the pages of the New Testament. They speak, indeed, of the greatness and glories of the kingdom of God; but it is a greatness and glory of an infinitely different order from anything that can ever be seen here. That eternal kingdom, with its risen and glorified Lord, shrinks not from association with what *here* is held to be weak and poor and of no account. Its very emblem is the Cross—earthly defeat, earthly suffering. Its diadem is the crown of thorns. It is here among the souls and the doings of men, "conquering and to conquer;" but its judgments and its conquests, and the awful steps of its march through time are masked and veiled behind the shows and shadows of this world, sometimes indicated, sometimes partly disclosed, but more than half kept back—too real not to be felt, too much hidden and crowded out by the things of the present to arrest the careless or the worldly heart. It is, indeed, such a kingdom as St. Paul describes in his Epistle to the Ephesians; day by day in the eternal world, by "the principalities and powers in heavenly places," it is seen how "in the dispensation of the fulness of times God hath gathered together all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth;" day by day *there* they continually cry, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory;" they sing the song of Moses and of the Lamb, saying, "Great and marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty: just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of saints. Who shall not fear Thee, O Lord, and glorify Thy Name? For Thou only art holy; for all nations shall come and worship before Thee; for Thy judgments are made manifest." "Alleluia! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." So they see, so they rejoice, in the "heavenly places;" but we cannot hear their song, their strain of perpetual praise. Here on earth the work and life of a minister and instrument of the kingdom of God is thus set before us: "By honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report; as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, yet not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things."

"My kingdom is not of this world," said the King Himself. It was not only a kingdom of righteousness, a universal kingdom: it would not, as so many expected, as so many desired and took for granted—it would not accept the conditions on which things are recognised and honoured as great, on the scene of this visible world. It would not as yet reveal all that it was, all that it could claim, all that one day would be known about it. It appealed to men, and challenged their homage, not by signs of power which the world could judge of, not by glory which could dazzle the world, but by those inner forces and tokens which the world imperfectly discerns—the powers of truth and holiness and love and goodness. The whole idea of the kingdom of God in the New Testament is of a kingdom out of sight, the most real, the most certain, the nearest of all things, whose power and presence were to be felt in the world in ways that experience had never dreamed of, but which baffled all experience when it tried to penetrate that impalpable barrier which made the kingdom of God unlike all human things. "The kingdom of God is within you," was the answer when the disciples looked for something which they could point to. "Blessed are the poor in spirit; blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." *Theirs* who are of the least account *here; theirs* to whom *here* is assigned the bitter lot of undeserved and unjust suffering. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" not dependent on outward necessaries of life and strength, but showing itself "not in word, but in power," by those heavenly virtues which mark His rule, Who is "King of Righteousness" and "King of Peace;" "by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned." "My kingdom is not of this world;" not of this world's customs, and this world's objects, and this world's instruments; not of this world's success or this world's vicissitudes; not amenable to this world's tests; not resting on what makes this world's strength; not altered by its revolutions, not failing with its failures: but behind all that this world sees and knows, lasting while men and nations come and go, strangely from time to time breaking in on the course of human affairs, the kingdom of God accompanies this world's history—the kingdom which was sung by psalmists, and imagined by prophets, and announced by apostles, moving on in its eternal order, whether opposed or neglected, or honoured upon earth, until "the mystery of God is finished,"

and His judgments are made manifest, and "the earnest expectation of the creature" shall be satisfied by "the manifestation of the sons of God."

That kingdom is "not of this world;" but it is *in* this world, and it has its witnesses and representatives in this world, in its varied and manifold aspects and working. It has its witnesses in individual souls. It has its witness, its representative, in the universal Church of Christ. Nothing can be an adequate representative of that invisible kingdom of God: it extends, even on earth, beyond the bounds of the universal Church. But His Church is the designated and appointed recognition of His kingdom, in a sense in which nothing was or could be before He came. "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel"—this was His language to the founders of His Church. And from the time that His Church was founded there was that personal relation to Him, the mystery and the closeness of which human words and images have been taxed to the utmost to shadow forth. "Head over all things to the Church, which is His Body, the fulness of Him Who filleth all in all:"—I need not tell you how those awful words are developed and illustrated, in the most unexpected ways, in the Epistles of St. Paul and the Gospel of St. John. The Church in Jewish times was part of the kingdom of God by laws and organisations: the Church of Christ by personal union with Him Who is the King Eternal. *That* must indeed be a very real part of the "kingdom of God," which is joined in such a communion with its King. That can be no mere voluntary association of men, thinking and feeling alike. That can be no creation of the will or power of earthly teachers or earthly rulers. Who could call into being so mysterious a fellowship but He Himself Whose unutterable love had brought Him into union with His creatures? Who could dare to use such words unless they come from Him Who sits on the throne of the kingdom of God?

This is that religious society which He has called into being, to be the shadow and the instrument of His kingdom, and which we call the Church of Christ; a religious society existing as a fact among the facts of the world, springing from faith and love to Him, depending on His words, worshipping His name, joined to His Person, and nourished by His sacraments, kept alive by His Spirit, continuing on from age to age of decay and change, by virtue of an order which has never failed, of a hope which nothing can destroy. This, we believe, is the Church of the Bible and of history; this is the Church of our Prayer-books; this and nothing less than this; this, and not another. It has looked very different to the outward eye in the many different stages of its actual course here. It has looked like an obscure and unpopular sect; it has looked like a wonderful human institution, vying with the greatest in age and power; it has looked like a great usurpation; it has looked like an overgrown and worn out system, out of date and ready to fall to pieces; it has been obscured by the outward accidents of splendour or disaster; it has been enriched, it has been plundered; at one time throned above Emperors, at another under the heel of the vilest; and it has been dishonoured by the crimes of its governors, by truckling to the world, by the idolatry of power, by greed and selfishess, by their unbelief in their own mission, by the deep stain of profligacy, by the deep stain of blood. Yes, "the treasure" was in "earthen vessels" in a very different sense from what the Apostle meant; it was in the hands of mortal and sinful men, and they have abundantly left the traces of their mortality and sin. But in that Church, whether for judgment or for blessing, or rather, surely for *both*—in it, in its core, in its unshaken depths, was the life and energy of the kingdom of God: never was the sense of its reality lost, never the faith in its King quenched; in the worst days of rebuke and blasphemy, from many an unknown altar, and many an unknown and humble heart, "hidden privily by *His* presence from the provoking of all men, kept secretly in *His* tabernacle from the strife of tongues," the songs of the kingdom of God went up unceasingly, witnessing to its continuous presence, telling of trust and love undisturbed, till the storm passed and the days were better. For the sake of the purposes and victories of the kingdom of God, the church was set up by its Master, Christ; for the sake of them it continues to be; the reason of its existence is that we believe Christianity to be, not an historical phenomenon, not a philosophy, not a mass of precepts and principles for individuals to choose from, but a divine religion. Forget that, and all is confusion in our thought of the Church. Remember that, and nothing of outward event or outward interference can take from her what she is.

But the Church cannot help on one side of it touching human society, its interests and its changes. That kingdom of God, for whose purposes the Church exists, cannot be moved. But the Church must have a human history. It may easily have to share the vicissitudes of those earthly things in which, at each moment of time, its lot may be cast. The course of its history at times has run parallel with that of human society, and in association with it—for human society, too, is part of the kingdom of God, and God takes care of what is His creation and watches over it in its best days and its worst. But so also the Church may find itself at cross purposes with the prevailing forces of society. We could hardly expect but that it must sometimes be so, when the invisible interests of the world to come find themselves in contact with the powers and interests of this world

Such moments may be, and have been, moments of great trial, well or ill borne, wisely or unwisely passed through. We cannot help seeing signs—they may be exaggerated, they cannot be said to be fanciful—that such a critical time may yet, sooner or later, be within our experience.

Before such times come, it is well to consider, calmly and devoutly, what should be the temper and attitude of the Church, when apparently called to prepare for the possibility of grave changes, it may be, great disadvantages, in its outward condition.

The first thing to remember and to imprint on our minds is that these changes in condition are in themselves *outward* things; and that the Church, though we see its members, and worship in its shrines, and handle its property, and teach in its schools, and join in its administration, is in itself, in the "soul and life of its being," the spiritual body of its invisible Lord and Bridegroom, the "house not made with hands," to be the "temple of the Holy Ghost;" a visible, a historic body indeed, but whose words are worse than idle unless it exists primarily and above all things for ends which are beyond this world, and is kept alive and shaped by influences which are not of this world. The Church, as we speak of it here, is first and above all things a religious society for religious ends; part, in time and in place, of that universal religious society which Jesus Christ created among men, and for whom and to whom He gives gifts for the blessing of the world. It seems a commonplace; but it is not so easy to translate it into a master principle of all judgment and all action in everything that relates to the Church. Yet it is only with a vivid and ever-present sense of what the Church really is and what it exists for, that we can rise to the height of any fitting and adequate and worthy argument as to the importance of outward things and their action on her proper interests.

But outward things may affect her very deeply. Outward things may be the machinery created and committed to her by her Master, to be used, as the time requires, for the ends of the kingdom of God. She has no more right to make light of that machinery, or to surrender it, than she could have the right to say that she could not do her Master's work without it. She has it; it is confessedly very powerful for the ends she is bound to seek; she cannot, without cowardice, without ignominy, affect not to care about it, at the first summons of hostility, or ignorance, or indifference. Surely we may be pardoned, if the prospect, even distant, of vast and unknown changes in the relations of the Church to society make us anxious. Surely it need not be personal position or material interests which must be supposed to fill all our thoughts at the chances of a possible great break-up, a tearing up of what has been so familiar to all of us, so precious and venerable to some of the noblest and best among us. A far-reaching unsettlement, which must cripple and embarrass religious work, which must humble the Church and the religion which the Church teaches, in the eyes of the world, may well stir the hearts of Churchmen who, if earthly loss could further the kingdom of God, or might even make human society go more smoothly and more righteously, would not shrink from saying that the Church had better resign itself to sacrifice what is its own of outward things. But such a result has not been made probable yet. And there can hardly be said to be such an exclusive sense of justice, such exclusive sympathy with high purposes, such manifest and equitable intelligence of all the bearings of the case, on the side of those who call for change, that Churchmen, who are Englishmen also, should not put their objections to it as strongly as they honestly and truthfully may, on the ground of civil right and social benefit; should not resist what seems to them a great wrong; should not shrink from lightly venturing on so tremendous an experiment on the moral and spiritual forces to which we are accustomed in England.

Who has a right to complain of this? Yet, after all, what *we* have to remember is, that the object of our interest is not merely a great and time-hallowed institution, bound up with the history and character of English society, but the Church of Christ among us, the "Church of the Living God." It is that which we have to think for; it is that for whose welfare we are in our day responsible; it is that for which, if there is danger, we must strive. It is high spiritual interests that we have to guard; the highest that we can conceive among us—the faith, the spirit, the gifts, the life of what we believe to be Christ's Holy Catholic Church. This high idea of what we mean by the Church is not only the true one, not only the one really worthy the enthusiasm of Churchmen, but it is the safest and most powerful appeal to the thoughts of reasonable men. It was this that in days of danger fifty years ago, the revival of the great idea of the Church, the extrication of it, in its religious and spiritual significance, from the earthly associations which had encumbered and obscured it—it was this, which in spite of great difficulties, great troubles, great disasters, staved off the dangers, and infused new life and elevation and strength into all our religion.

Yet, after all, our Master has said, "My kingdom is not of this world." No words have been so misused, with such blind inconsistency and recklessness of their recoil, so that they seemed to hit an opponent. But there they are, all the same; they mean much for *us*, however they may be misquoted by others:—

"This is a text," says an impressive writer,* "which has, as it were, looked at the Church ever since the Church was

* Dr. Mozley, *University Sermons*, Sermon I.

founded. It is like an eye fixed upon her, from which she cannot escape. . . . Go where she will, and in whatever divergent paths, and branches of those paths, and circuits of those paths, that eye has been upon her. . . . That saying has looked through history, on all the successive phases of the Church's worldly position."

It has looked, and often in vain. But there the words stand, with their warning to us. They warn us as to the methods, as to the temper, as to the reasonings with which we wage our warfare for the Church of Christ. They warn us that there may be many ways legitimate, or at any rate customary, in questions of this world, which do not become those who are contending for what is *not* of this world. They warn us not to lose our sense of the realities of the kingdom of God, even in our zeal for its honour; not to lose our sense of proportion, even in asserting its claim to what is its own, to what cannot without wrong be taken from it. They bid us keep watch over our hearts and lips; to be just to others, even if they are unjust to us; to leave to those who will the language of passion, or exaggeration, much more of recrimination and insult; to remember to *whom* it was said, "Ye know not what spirit ye are of;" to remember *where* it is said, "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." And, above all, they warn us against a temptation which has before now come in the path of the Church, and may again—the temptation of paying too high a price to gain, or to retain, the advantages of this world. There are few among us with knowledge so large and thought so comprehensive as to be able to take in the full measure of the blessing of a Church like ours, which can speak to the nation as nothing else can, which holds such a machinery for good in its hands. But we may be asked to pay too highly for keeping what we so value. We may be asked to give up in exchange what we have no right to part with; to barter things that concern the life of the Church as a religious body; to turn the Church which we have received into something different; to consent to precipitate experiments and ill-considered compromises; to rush, under the alarm and perhaps danger of the moment, into projects of hasty change, in the hope of stopping a cry. Let us do our best, let us try to leave things better than we found them in the Church and in the world; let us "quit us like men," men of sense, men of courage, if we are forced into a struggle which must be a trying and a stern one; but let us remember, amid all its fortunes, *Who* has said—"*My* kingdom is not of this world."

Only let us do nothing unworthy of that "kingdom of God," in which we serve, to which we trust, and which has in it all our hopes. We are like soldiers in a vast, widely extended battle-field, wrapped in obscurity, of which we know not the phases, of which we seem utterly powerless to control the issues; but we *are* responsible for our own part; whatever goes on elsewhere, let us not fail in that. The changes of the world, which men think that they are bringing about, are in the hands of God. With Him, when we have done our duty, let us leave them. Only may we have grace from the Merciful and the True, before Whom St. Paul bent his knee, to "know how we ought to behave ourselves in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth;" remembering what is that Truth of truths which the Church exists to keep and to preach—"Without controversy great is the Mystery of Godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 9, 1886.

## CHURCH REFORM.

BEFORE fresh legislation on this subject, as urged by the Cambridge and other memorialists, is resorted to, we should like to see a vigorous and business-like attempt made by the chief pastors and rulers, as well as by the rank and file of the clergy, who already possess large administrative powers, to effect useful reforms in the Church, without wasting time in the well-nigh hopeless task of asking for additional Acts of Parliament. Such a course of action on the part of the functionaries of the Church would assuredly be welcomed by the laity, and would prove the desire and willingness of the clergy to reform the abuses and to promote the efficiency of the Church. We believe that the ancient Constitution of the Establishment may do better for the good government and consequent peace of the Church, when cleared of the accretions and encroachments with which, in the course of many centuries, it has become encumbered and crippled, than the calling into existence any new-fangled Parochial Councils or Administrative Boards. Once upon a time the affairs of the Church appear to have been considerably more under the control and supervision of the vestries than they are at the present. This control has been weakened and well-nigh abrogated by the unwise abolition of church rates, and the parson, always a very permanent official, has become

paramount in the ordering and execution not only of the services, but also of all the secular affairs of the Church. If he continues to preside at all vestry meetings, he should voluntarily surrender the privilege of appointing one of the churchwarden both should be representatives of the laity, and have absolute control over the finances and secular business of the Church. It would increase the dignity and importance of the office if the churchwardens were entirely emancipated from clerical influence and control. This would be effectually done if the Bishops would set over them, as advisers and inspectors, lay, in lieu of clerical, Archdeacons. Might not also laymen be held to be qualified to act as Rural Deans and Surrogates? The chief reform asked for by the numerous memorialists is in order to induce the laymen to take a more active and prominent part in the work of religion; and it seems to us that the most practical way of accomplishing this end is to promote laymen to offices of real business and responsibility in Church government. An admitted defect in our Church system, as compared with that of Presbyterians, Protestant Dissenters, and other religious bodies, is that the laity take little interest in the work; that they have little authority or responsibility and no real business to transact. If the Bishops and clergy would at once initiate the above-mentioned reforms, which require no fresh Acts of Parliament, we believe that very many more of the laity would become active and useful agents in religious work, and that in many parishes a voluntary church rate or subscription would be readily paid to defray the expenses of the church, schools, and missions. The duties of churchwardens are, we believe, strictly limited to the administration of secular affairs: they have and should have no power to interfere with the teaching and doctrine of the minister. There is, therefore, no validity in the objection that the parochial vestrymen might elect a Nonconformist as churchwarden. In the Metropolis we have known many Dissenters, and even Quakers, make excellent churchwardens. A reform of this character would be in accord with, and would probably strengthen, our existing Church system, whereas the appointment of Parochial Councils "with statutory powers" would revolutionise the system, and in a few years perhaps arrogate to themselves the functions and powers not only of the incumbent, but also of the Bishop—functions of administration which we hold are always better discharged by responsible individuals than by irresponsible councils and boards. And we hold that, as regards the laymen of the Church, there has been failure in administration rather than in legislation.

Again, is it not well within the power, if not the sacred duty of the Bishops, to enrich, enlarge, and make more practical the teaching and preaching of the officiating ministers? There are many born orators and experienced teachers in all ranks of the laity, who, if ordained by the Bishop, would prove more acceptable teachers and guides, and more useful preachers to the majority of the congregation, than young curates, who may perhaps have abundance of book learning, but little knowledge of the world or of nature. There are many Wesleyan and other nonconforming ministers, retired soldiers, sailors, and other professional men, who by education and by experience of life are most competent to become excellent guides and true elders of the Church of Christ. Many of our Bishops have for years eloquently discoursed on the advantages of "Home Re-union," but we have never been able to understand why they did not prove the sincerity of their words and wishes by making it a *fait accompli*, by recognising the Orders of the Presbyterian Church, and by admitting with their own hands all such competent dissenting ministers as desired it into holy orders of the Church of England. This is a matter entirely within the power and discretion of the Bishops, and they could not do wrong in following the example of the head of their Church, the Queen, who is a member of the Church of Scotland, and who recognises the Orders of most Protestant Dissenting ministers. We believe that Bishop Moorhouse has done it in Australia; and we are confident that our Bishops would effect a considerable reform, and greatly strengthen the position of the Church by boldly and liberally admitting into its ministry men of the stamp and status we have alluded to. Lord Sidney G. Osborne, in the *Times* of the 4th inst., expresses the same opinion:—

> I agree with many of the warmest friends of the Church, that we should gain much valuable aid by some process by which men of matured years, pious and earnest, with a strong desire to enter the Church ministry, could be ordained, and in all respects held qualified, although they may not have had a classical education or any special theological training. At that age the character will have been fully formed, and, whatever may have been the line of life they have followed, if they have a strong desire to enter into the ministry, they would do so in a spirit and with the earnestness and zeal likely to make them most useful, especially as auxiliaries to the clergy of large towns.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### ST. PAUL'S INSPIRATION AND TEACHING.

SIR,—Allow me to add by way of correction to my last week's letter on "Kindness to Animals," that I intended to contrast unfavourably with the Epistles to Timothy the 1st Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, and not that to the Corinthians, which is unquestionably a very grand Epistle. I cannot conceive how I allowed such a misprint to pass muster. The date commonly assigned to the 1st of Thessalonians is the year 54. The 1st Epistle to Timothy is usually dated from 65, eleven years later. The 1st of Corinthians is assigned

to 59, between the two. I cannot but recognise growing largeness of heart and vision on the part of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. Granting that he was essentially inspired throughout, yet there are degrees of inspiration ; the sacred water that flows from Siloam's fount is at times troubled by falling rains, and the stirring up of an earthly deposit, which mixes with the waters. This St. Paul admits and affirms expressly in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, where he writes :—"I speak this by permission, and not of commandment" ; and again :—"Concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord." One cannot refrain from the wish that this being the case, St. Paul might have refrained from expressing a private opinion, which was made the excuse for many centuries after for all manner of Gnostic excesses and corruptions. St. Paul's natural disposition to overstate his case in passionate zeal is very patent to every thoughtful student of his Epistles generally. He is rarely satisfied with a good argument, but often adds a bad one, as in his denial of the binding character of an Old Testament injunction to consideration for oxen, in order to prove, what needed no such proof, that Christians were under the obligation of maintaining and supporting their authorised teachers. Thus again, when he wishes to prove, what is most sure, that all the world is guilty before God, and that none can be saved by meritorious works, he uses language which *seems* to imply that all were equally guilty, or to the same extent, and when he upholds the saving character of faith, he allows himself to speak for the moment as if sin was as acceptable to Almighty God as righteousness, saying that "God justifieth the ungodly." No doubt this is set straight by many strong assertions, even in the same Epistle, of the necessity for good works or practical holiness ; but no honest man can fail to discern, with St. Peter, that St. Paul's language is peculiarly liable at times to misinterpretation. "As our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given him, hath written to you ; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things ; in which are some things hard to be understood, which those who are unlearned and unstable wrest (as they do also the other Scriptures) to their own *great injury*."

But if there is one thing growingly asserted, with more and more of love and power in the Epistles of St. Paul, it is the ultimate universal restoration and redemption of all mankind. Were it not for this, the most narrow Calvinist would be justified by his assertion of God's peculiar and, as it might then be imagined, exclusive love for His elect. "What if God endured the vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction," etc., etc. But in the very same Epistle, that to the Romans, the great Apostle calls out, a little further on, "God hath included them all in unbelief, *that He might have mercy upon all!* O, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!" There is scarcely one of St. Paul's Epistles which does not proclaim, or at least assume, the ultimate restoration of all creatures ; this may be said to be his fundamental doctrine, but it is most powerfully and sweepingly expressed, perhaps in his mature utterance, the 1st Epistle to Timothy. There we see the growing largeness of heart, which makes the Apostle recognise "ministers of God" in heathen rulers, and bids men pray for these. "I exhort that intercessions and thanksgivings be made for all men, for kings, etc., for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.' Immediately afterwards the Apostle goes on to affirm that our Lord "gave Himself a ransom for all—*to be testified in due time*." Why to be testified *in due time?* By the power of God's Holy Spirit, doubtless, when men's minds should be able to receive it. The malignant and lascivious wickedness of the heathen world, which lay in wickedness, presented an enormous obstacle, lest "divine philosophy should be the procuress of hell," by persuading men that all would come right eventually, offend as they might. Therefore the plain teaching of St. Paul on this point wrought no lasting conviction in the minds of men. It is in vain that he expressed his trust in "the Living God, who is the Saviour of all ;" the littleness of men's minds seized on the next words, "specially of those that believe," which of course only implied that they would enter into life immediately or first, and preferred to think that heathens should never really profit by "the common salvation," and that meanness and littleness of mind and heart lasts to the present hour, when there is so much less excuse for it than there was in a world wholly given up to wickedness and folly. Now, however, it has to be testified, and that freely and clearly, that our dear Lord "gave Himself a ransom for *all*" (not for all *men*), although it is equally certain that only a comparatively small body of human creatures pass at once through the narrow gate which few find. The careless, the proud, the licentious, the worldly-hearted, go along the broad way that leadeth, not to destruction, but to separation from God and light, in the outer darkness, and go into that world of spirits, where our dear Lord preached the Gospel of salvation to the lost by the broad and ever open gate. Now this all-important portion of *the Catholic faith* is apparently ignored in the 1st Epistle to the Thessalonians, which is written in a more or less impatient spirit, easily explained by the very evil condition of men's minds. The whole of the passage about the Lord Himself descending with a shout is (in my poor judgment) somewhat elementary. No doubt there is a great underlying truth, but the language seems very literal, and this is improved upon in the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians (also written in the year 54), where the Apostle tells about "the Lord Jesus being revealed from heaven, with His mighty angels, in flaming fire, *taking vengeance* on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction, that is with æonial chastisement and banishment from the presence of the Lord." Contrast this with our dear Lord's own express teaching, that those who know *not* shall be beaten with *few stripes;* and again with the matured mind of the great Apostle, when he distinctly affirms that God is the (ultimate) Saviour of all men. Even these Epistles to the Thessalonians are doubtless, in the main, inspired epistles. They bid us abound in love, not only to one another, *but toward all men*, and that would be quite inconsistent with calmly contemplating the prospect of the endless sin and misery of the overwhelming majority, and they contain that wonderful prophecy of the development of internal corruption *within the Church*, which should culminate in the power of the man of sin, who is (in my judgment) unquestionably the type of the Latin Papacy, claiming the possession of the keys of death and hell, and professing to exercise for a time, two times, and a half (1260 years), the very power of God, and that, in spite of our Lord's distinct prohibition to His Church

as a whole, to call any man its Father. "Call no man your father upon earth," etc.

I repeat, then, that universalism, so called, is the most distinctive doctrine of St. Paul, universal ultimate redemption, though it is taught also by St. Peter and by St. John, and by our Blessed Lord Himself. St. Peter tells us of our Lord's preaching to the worst of all "lost souls," those who had sinned in the days of Noah, every imagination of whose hearts had been evil continually, that they might be judged in the sight of men, and might, finally, "live before God in the spirit." St. John tells us in his Gospel that "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that *the world* through Him might be saved;" and our dear Lord, besides distinctly laying down the principle and *rationale* of corrective punishment, few stripes and many, unequivocally declared—"I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." It is time that the hideous night-mare which has oppressed the intellect and conscience of Christendom so long should be finally dismissed to the limbo of vanities,—high time that the glorious promise of Israel should be accomplished, and that God should destroy the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations, and swallow up death in victory.

Let not good men rebel any longer, therefore, against the testimony of the living God!

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
January 2, 1886.

## DISENDOWMENT.

SIR,—Allow me to point out that, in his haste to controvert my proposition, Mr. Lawrence has so curiously misunderstood it, as to suppose that he is refuting it, when in reality he is adopting it and illustrating it by an example? My proposition, verbally misquoted by him, is that "Disestablishment and Disendowment are not matters of abstract right and wrong, but are dependent on circumstances for their moral character." This is a general proposition, not a special one confined to the case of the English Church. Mr. Lawrence admits it so far as Disestablishment is concerned, but denies it in regard to Disendowment. To sustain this denial, he weaves an argument to prove that the nature and history of the endowments of the English Church—that is, *the circumstances of this particular case*,—determine Disendowment to be wrong in this instance. Why, what is this but to accept the very proposition he undertakes to disprove, and make it the basis of his argument against the Disendowment of the English Church? He denies that the character of the proposal to disendow depends at all on the circumstances of the case, and then argues that those circumstances are the very things which stamp the proposal with immorality! Whether his argument is sound or otherwise has nothing to do with my proposition. That keeps entirely clear of special applications, and merely lays down a general principle. Mr. Lawrence refutes the principle by accepting and applying it in a particular case!

But let us go a little further. The circumstances of churches in regard of endowment are very different in different cases. Cross the Tweed, and the circumstances are so changed that Mr. Lawrence's special argument for the English Church is no longer applicable. His argument has for its postulate the *continuity of the English Church*. He assumes that the body enjoying the ancient endowments now is the same body as that to which they were originally given. It has been alleged on the other hand that they were given to a body in vital communion with and dependence upon the See of Rome, and that the body which now holds them, having no such communion and dependence, is an essentially different one. On this ground Romanists hold that the present English Church is enjoying stolen goods. If this were true, Mr. Lawrence's case would collapse; hence it is necessary for his position to assert that the continuity of the Church has not been broken by the disruption from the See of Rome. But in the case of the Scotch Established Church, there is no pretence of such continuity. As far as it possesses ancient endowments, originally meant for a Church dependent on the Roman See, the possession needs other arguments for its justification.

Or, let us go to our older Colonies. There the circumstances are entirely different from those in both the English and the Scotch cases. The colonists will tell us that with them the Church has been recently disendowed, the existing life-interests alone being secured. But what is meant by disendowment is the withdrawal of the incomes paid by the State to the incumbents of certain bishoprics, archdeaconries, and parishes. There is nothing in Mr. Lawrence's argument to touch in any way the morality of such disendowment.

Notwithstanding, therefore, the somewhat supercilious dogmatism of Mr. Lawrence's denial of my proposition, I not only re-affirm it without any hesitation, but claim Mr. Lawrence himself as a maintainer of it. I feel confident that the more he reflects on the question before us, the fuller will be his conviction that it is impossible to pronounce on the morality of any scheme of disendowment for any Church, on merely abstract grounds, without reference to existing and qualifying circumstances.

So far I have not said a word about the rightness or wrongness of any scheme of disendowment for the English Church, because the subject lies outside my contention. But I cannot forbear adding that I should be exceedingly sorry to think that no better case could be made out for her retention of her ancient endowments, than that which Mr. Lawrence presents. It is as certain as anything future can be, that the controversy in her case will not turn, in any appreciable degree, on antiquarian researches into the origin of those endowments, or on ecclesiastical views of the relation of the post-reformation to the pre-reformation Church, or on metaphysical discussions of the limits of the right inherent in sovereign States to interfere with the property whether of individuals or of corporations, but on matters of a much more practical kind. Let the Church, in the use of her revenues and the exercise of her functions, show herself comprehensive, generous, unselfish, humble, abundant in all good works, bearing witness through the length and breadth of the land for the spirituality and piety which her Lord's example teaches, and she will gird round her endowments with a rampart more effectual than tens of thousands of such arguments as that which Mr. Lawrence constructs in her defence.

One word more. I cannot credit with much practical force an argument which would remain untouched by the defection of the entire body of the laity; and would to the ecclesiastical corporations, left "alone in

their glory," without any congregations to minister to, or useful functions to perform for the commonwealth, assure in perpetuity the indefeasible enjoyment of their ancient revenues. I should rather say that any sovereign State which, on the ground of the alleged absolute proprietary rights of perpetual corporations, suffered such a condition of things to continue, would deserve to be proceeded against for lunacy in the court of nations, could such a court be got together for its trial.

PRESBYTER.

P.S.—In the last paragraph but one of my letter of last week *theological* is a misprint for *teleological*.

## IRISH CHURCH.

SIR,—Our primate departed this life on St. Stephen's day, and his body was placed in its last resting place in the crypt of our Cathedral, on the last day of the year 1885. It may interest your readers to be informed of the proceeding for appointing his successor.

The Synod of a diocese, in our Church, elects the bishop. But the Primate of Ireland is elected by the House of Bishops, from their own completed college; and in case the Bishop of Armagh and Clogher shall not be chosen to be primate, then the bishop who is so chosen, becomes Archbishop of Armagh and Bishop of Clogher; and the sometime Bishop of Armagh becomes bishop of the diocese vacated. There are sundry anticipations in this diocese at present, and throughout Ireland generally, as to what will be done. The general opinion is, that the proceeding, involving probably the shifting of bishops from one diocese to another, is clumsy and unsatisfactory. (It is my opinion) The clergy of these two united dioceses (Armagh and Clogher) are not unnaturally disposed to have some eminent man from among themselves raised to the Episcopal Bench. But suppose that such were done, and some other bishop were then chosen to be primate, the Armagh and Clogher bishop would be forced on another diocese; to the dissatisfaction, very likely, of the clergy and people thereof.

Under these circumstances, there is some project of electing either the Bishop of Down or the Bishop of Derry to the vacancy here; in which case the House of Bishops, to whom either of those esteemed prelates would be agreeable, would almost as a matter of course choose him for primate, and Archbishop of Armagh. Then the vacated diocese, Derry or Down, would be free to choose a successor.

For my own part, I do not see why this diocese should be placed in an exceptional or peculiar position at all, as respecting the bishop. The primacy is titular only; it carries no power, precedence only; and, as consequence of precedence, the presidency of the General Synod.

Will you allow me to add the following?—There is in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette* of to-day a letter from the Rev. C. J. Buchanan, formerly a curate (I presume) in this diocese. He says that his work in England is harder than his work here was, but "pleasanter, and not (as I fear work in Ireland is) intended to please any party." If Mr. Buchanan means that he fears that when he was working in Ireland he was intending to please a party, low church, high church, or orangemen, more than to do his duty, it is certainly well that he has been removed from a country where he was subject to any especial temptations to do so. If he means anything else, for instance, to insinuate that the Irish clergy are disposed to act in the way that he describes; I think he ought to be more definite. I have been acquainted with this diocese for a long time, and I have lived in it for several years. I am able to say that a clergyman who does his duty, no matter to what church school (I hate the word party so applied) he may belong, low, high, or broad; will not fail, and that soon, to receive the approbation of his parishioners. I know quite well, of course, that the tastes of the people here are puritanical; and there are extreme people that are given to Plymouthism. But on the whole, we are not the narrow lot that Mr. Buchanan seems to suggest.

SUBSCRIBER.

Armagh, January 2nd, 1886.

## JAMES v. 11.

SIR,—I have to thank "Presbyter" for his reply to my paper on "The End of the Lord," but though I see the force of his arguments for the interpretation, "the end of his trials that the Lord gave to Job," I do not think he has met my objections to it. "Ye have *heard of* the patience of Job, and have *seen* the end of trial that the Lord granted him." I fail to understand how "seen" in the second clause is required by the sense, as needing "intellectual perception" on the part of the reader. Both the trials and the triumph of Job were known by hearing or reading, and in no other way.

He says that the readers of the Epistle could not be called eye-witnesses of the death of Christ, because a new generation had grown up in thirty years. I do not believe the Epistle of James can be shown to be written at so late a date; but if it is so, what then? It is thirty years this year since the Crimean War ended, and it would not seem strange to say that the present generation has witnessed the fall of Sebastopol.

He thinks it "exceedingly flat and unsatisfactory" to speak of "the end of the Lord" as referring to His sufferings, without taking His glory into account. This overlooks what I think I have shown, that with the writers of the New Testament, the word which is generally translated *end*, but *fulfilment* in one place of the Revised Version, has two distinct though intertwined associations — end of trial, and fulfilment of prophecy.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 3rd January, 1886.

## "THE STATUTE LAW CONCERNING AFFINITIES."

SIR,—"Text" is doubtless correct, that, according to Judge-made law, the marriage with a deceased wife's sister is ruled to be illegal; but he altogether fails to disprove that the 28 Henry VIII, c. 7, sect. 7, was repealed by the 1 Elizabeth, c. 1. How any judges could say that that Act of Parliament was "clearly in force," when the Act of Repeal stated "that it shall stand, remain, and be repealed, . . . anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding," was perhaps only known to themselves.

Judge Vaughan stated, "a man is prohibited by the 28 Henry VIII., c. 7, and by the received

interpretation of the Levitical degrees, absolutely to marry his wife's sister ; but within the meaning of Leviticus and the constant practice of the Commonwealth of the Jews, a man was prohibited not to marry his wife's sister only during her lifetime ; after he might. This is a knot not perhaps easily untied, how the Levitical degrees are God's law in this kingdom, but not as they were in the Commonwealth of Israel when first given." It would seem therefore that this Judge-made law is far from being a consistent law, for while the "Lords," in the case of Brook *v.* Brook, said the marriage was contrary to the law of God, Judge Vaughan said that it was not prohibited by God to the Jews.

The Registrar General certainly considers that the 28 Henry VIII., c. 7, sect 7, is "clearly in force," for it is only by that Act that marriages are forbidden with deceased concubines' sisters, and which marriages the Registrar General and Archdeacon Hessey contend are illegal ; on the other hand, the Archbishop of Canterbury maintains that "the list of prohibited degrees of marriage, given at the end of the Book of Common Prayer, mentions the *individuals* between whom marriages may not be contracted ;" and the Bishop of London writes me—"That a man should commit fornication with a woman and then marry a near relation of hers, would be a revolting thing ; but I know no decision or *dictum* of authority which puts any legal prohibition in the way."

There is no doubt that it would be "a revolting thing" for a man to marry a *living* concubine's sister ; but if an affinity is created, through the "unlawful company of a man and woman," with that woman's sister, and that affinity is binding after the death of the "concubine" or "harlot," and the man is forbidden to marry a deceased concubine's sister, then holy matrimony does not more closely unite a man and woman, than they are united by "unlawful company."

I am supported by the Bishop of London in the statement, that there is no unrepealed statute which forbids marriage with a deceased concubine's sister, and this marriage and that with a deceased wife's sister having both been forbidden by the same Act of Parliament, it follows that the latter prohibition also is removed from the Statute Book.

ALFRED COLE.

January 4, 1886.

## DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOWMENT.

SIR,—Allow me to thank the Rev. Archer Gurney for his courteous mention of me.

1. While I fear for the English Church the fate of ours, I deeply deplore such an act of national infidelity.

2. I speak of disendowment. As to disestablishment, so far as Bishops retiring from the House of Lords, I contemplate that with resignation, if not with complacency. I remember Sir Robert Walpole's condition on appointing a Primate, that he should take to his bed whenever an approaching important discussion made the Bishops' votes of consequence. Times are changed ; but still we cannot forget the present Primate's haste to vote, robing as he went along, *viresque acquirit eundo*. After that I never desire to see episcopal robes so trampled in the mire of political strife.

3. Mr. Gurney allows, in opposition to Mr. Gladstone's fairy tales, that our antiquity equals or surpasses yours, whilst our descent of Bishops is more unquestioned. But he says that our loss of the people, through English tyranny as to our episcopal and other appointments, made our degradation just. Well, if Wales sinks as low in numbers, its plunder must follow —"like case, like rule." But counting heads seems a very extraordinary rule to go by, as to the treatment of the Catholic Church of any country. In Cromwell's time the Church property might as fairly have been taken from the English Church as ours has now been taken from us. The alienation of the Scotch Church property to Presbyterians is also, by this rule, sanctioned. If Rome were consulted, I am sure she would say that numbers should never decide a Church's claim to its title, status, or property.

4. Mr. Gurney would allow Home Rule here, with a Parliament named by Mr. Parnell (no House of Lords) to manage all Irish matters. This would begin by ruining all loyalists, by throwing all possible burdens on land, by turning over Trinity College to Romanists, if not endowing the Romish priesthood ! We know what it would do now by what it did in King James's time. Rome is unchangeable. Every English feeling must be eradicated from the country. This is the object of Home Rule, "to cut the last link," as the priest said. For this Mr. Parnell took off his coat. You may stand aside till this is done to us, merely because we are faithful to you ! But the end is not yet. You will have either to allow us to be a hostile neighbour at your side, or else conquer us again as did Cromwell and King William. This must be the end of Home Rule. So now you know what is before you. We may vanish, but your difficulty remains as it has been ever since Strongbow landed. A monstrous demand is already made, that the police should be under the control of the rebels —the wolves be the guardians of the sheep ! Let any one look at the Dublin Corporation, and the names sent up to the Lord Lieutenant for the office of High Sheriff of the City of Dublin. The law gives this power to the Corporation, and obliges the Lord Lieutenant to select one of the three names. They put his Excellency in a dilemma by offering up the three most outrageous rebels they can select—*ex uno disce omnes*.

5. Allow me to add a word in reply to Mr. J. J. Murphy, of Belfast. He denies that we had to buy back our glebe houses, built out of our own pockets. But the Act of 1869 obliges us to pay for our glebe houses ten years' purchase of the land on which they stand, including garden and curtilage. It allows us, even, to *buy* only ten acres of our own glebe land, whereas it allows Presbyterian ministers to buy back as much as is permitted for our Bishops.

6. I am willing to allow what Mr. Gurney says, that Englishmen generally opposed our plunder. He knows England better than I can pretend to do. But is it not strange that when Mr. Gladstone "raised his head, &c.," and told the House that Elizabeth established us, no one in either House exposed his romance ? Is it not strange that every periodical, newspaper, and novel in England reproduces still this same groundless figment, which I am not surprised to see is now repeated of your Church ? When one lie is believed another follows.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V. G. of Kildare.

## Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." January, 1886. London: Hodder and Stoughton. "THE MONTHLY INTERPRETER," January, 1886. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co.

WE put these two magazines together, because we can then compare Canon Driver's paper in the former with Mr. Deane's in the latter, on that well-worn, but ever interesting subject, the Six Days of Genesis. Even the turmoil of the elections, with its flood of personalities, lies, abuse, and vulgarity, did not quite overshadow the interest of Mr. Gladstone's article in the *Nineteenth Century*, and Professor Huxley's reply; and now that quiet has come, temporarily at any rate, we can read Canon Driver and Mr. Deane without distraction. "Do the days of Genesis," says Canon Driver, "correspond with well defined geological periods? and does the order in which different living beings are stated to have been created agree with the facts of Geology? To both these questions candour compels the answer, No." We will not venture to contradict Canon Driver, the more so because we receive his statement with perfect equanimity. Curious it is how few realise that more than half the Old Testament is poetry, and who expects that poetry should march in step with science? "IN MEMORIAM" is descriptive of the effect of a great sorrow; doubtless there are—or, at any rate, there might be—descriptions of the same thing in medical treatises, but not "corresponding" to "In Memoriam." Mr. Kane tells us that in the *Dublin Review* for April, 1881, the theory that Genesis i. ii. 1—3 is a kind of "sacred hymn" is propounded. We are happy to find ourselves quite in agreement with this Roman Catholic divine on a subject which is neutral ground to all Christendom.

In the *Interpreter* Mr. Findlay has a very careful study of St. Paul's Doctrine of the Church: in the *Expositor* Dr. Westcotts writes on the Epistle to the Hebrews in his usual strain of condensed eloquence. Principal Dawson's paper on the Physical Causes of the Destruction of the Cities of the Plain is most interesting and instructive. According to his theory, the same thing might occur again, and quite possibly will occur again in the petroleum-producing regions of Canada and the United States. When natural reservoirs of petroleum are bored, the gas they contain often escapes with explosive force, and if ignited, being almost inextinguishable, is most destructive. And after such an eruption, subsidence often takes place. This supplies a quite natural explanation, in no way denying a concurrent moral explanation.

Professor Delitsch waxes eloquent on the Bible and wine—a delightfully poetic paper; and in the *Interpreter* Professor Forbes has a very good exposition of Psalm viii. We are very glad Dr. Maclaren's exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians is continued in the *Expositor*.

---

'MARIUS THE EPICUREAN: HIS SENSATIONS AND IDEAS." By Walter Pater, M.A. In two volumes. Second edition. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

MR. PATER'S "Renaissance," in its luscious beauty, had scarcely prepared us for the singular loveliness and placid grandeur of "Marius," the chastened and ripened fruit of years of thought and meditation. This is a noble endeavour to realise the mental and moral life of a Roman of the days of the Antonines, who feels his way gradually from the best and purest heathenism to the threshold of Christianity, where he falls the victim of a noble act of self-sacrifice, wrought to save a Christian friend. The style of the book is classical in a high degree, slightly Latin, stately, and full of a lofty music, only marred by one singular catch-word of the author's, which he seems to repeat unconsciously, and which should be cancelled previous to the issue of the next edition,—a vernacular phrase, contrasting strangely with the finished elegance of the rest,—"and all that." The work is divided into four parts, and opens with a singularly vivid and yet mellow description of the so-called religion of Numa and worship of the household gods. Wonderfully does Mr. Pater realise the condition of a youthful reverential soul in that period of gradual decay and old age of heathenism, and exquisitely does he bring out the distinctive excellency of that worship in this, and yet more in the third chapter, dealing with the "*cultus*" of Æsculapius, in the honour rendered by men to the healthfulness of the human body,—to be, alas! so grievously "neglected" by a bastard Christianity, under the influence of miserable gnosticism, or rather of the great foretold Apostasy. Mr. Pater is far too gentle, if we may venture to say so, in dealing with this most unfortunate of human follies, for which he thinks an excuse may be discovered in those divine precepts which bade us hate father, mother, wife and children, that is, act as if we hated them, rather than be faithless to divine truth and love. Nobody can give an impression corresponding to fact of the real declension of faith and practice within the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, who fails to identify it with the foretold falling away, the forbidden worship of the spirits of the departed, of "Daimons," not devils, and the fatal confusion of use with abuse, forbidding loftier souls to marry, or to employ God's manifold gifts. Mr. Pater is doubtless right enough when he represents the Church of the second century, and especially of the age of the Antonines, as in possession of a chastened peace and golden life, uniting the best qualities, in their ideal aspect, of expiring heathenism and dawning Christianity; but how soon was this to pass away? But to return to "Marius," nothing can be lovelier than the description of the Æsculapian temple and worship, bathing the soul in a very fountain of purity and peace, and yet leaving the sense of something wanting, a definite revelation of divine love and pity. The friendship of Marius and the brilliant Flavian, and the latter's early death, are admirably pourtrayed. We are made to feel the hopelessness of human life at its best without the sustaining sense of immortality and of an over-ruling Father. All this is given with exceeding delicacy, with a chastened beauty, which enables the sympathetic reader to realise the inner life of a son of imperial Rome. Then, in the second part, we are taken to Rome itself, and the great Aurelius, in his largeness of soul, and sad, almost unutterable pessimism, is most admirably portrayed, with his brilliant wife, Faustina, his sweet children, his aged favourite, the rhetorician Fronto, and his court. But, first, we are shown how an elevated Epicureanism or Cyrenaicism could be entertained by a lofty and aspiring soul, which sought pleasure in the pure enjoyment of earth's best delights, and in the discharge of manly duty. It is a little strange that Marius never falls in love. He is attracted at one

time by a Christian widow, Cecilia, a pure and noble creature, but this attraction seems to be temporary only. A stronger and more permanent feeling is his friendship for a noble youthful Christian, Cornelius, a centurion of the imperial guard, contrasting by his healthful, buoyant life, and noble manly soberness of spirit, with the dispirited world around him, and with the profoundly melancholy Emperor whose prose elegy on the old and evil theme of "Vanity of vanities" is powerfully given in the 12th chapter of the second part or book. Yet, apart from the knowledge and service of a God of love, the sense of the fleetingness of human things would be an all but overwhelming burden to bear. Our impression is strengthened that Marcus Aurelius, though he possessed a lofty soul, was not an original thinker, but simply reflected the best stoical thought of his age. His colleague, Lucus Verus, is also admirably drawn, one who may be best likened to a beauteous leopard with shining skin and cruel claws. The assistance of the Emperors at the games of the circus is graphically placed before us, and so is Rome the mighty in its grand external splendour. In the third part, the shortest of the four, we have an admirable reproduction of one of Fronto's orations on the loveliness of virtue, apart from any binding moral obligation, and the nobler aspect of heathenism, all it could attain to at the best and utmost, is carefully and elaborately brought before us. In the fourth part comes the vision of Christianity in Cecilia's house, contrasted with the comparative emptiness of heathen merry-making, and a most beautiful description of the celebration of the Christian mysteries follows as they impressed themselves on the mind and soul of the casually on-looking Marius. Here Mr. Pater rises to his loftiest height, in a chapter which the world is never likely to let die. The famous Lucian is then introduced to point, in a very clever dialogue, the hollowness and extreme uncertainty of all heathen philosophising, and finally, the self-sacrificing death of the hero is very simply but beautifully related, who receives the last sacraments of the Church of God in a half-unconscious state, his practical martyrdom being counted to him for holy baptism. As a tale, 'Marius the Epicurean" has no pretensions to much consideration ; and may be easily slighted by a hasty reader ; as a study of the inner life of the age of the Antonines, as a demonstration of the eternal beauty of the Christian faith, "Marius" is one of those chastened masterpieces which may be said, in Tennyson's language, "to enrich the lifeblood of the world." Few masterpieces of this kind can be expected from any generation, and Mr. Pater may have the satisfaction of knowing that he has added a classic to his country's literature, and given a noble and conclusive demonstration of the world's need of the Faith.

THE Attorney-General, replying to the request of the chairman of the Free and Open Church Society (Mr. Herford) for support to the Society's Parishionery Rights (anti-pew) Bill, requests to see a print of is which he will "be pleased to consider," observing, "I warmly sympathise with the movement for making all churches free and open, and I am strongly in favour of churches being open during the whole day. I have often spoken upon both questions."

CHURCH EXTENSION AT THE EAST END.—Miss Pope, of Kensington Park Gardens, has generously presented the Rev. Dr. Egan, Vicar of Christ Church, South Hackney, with a valuable and commanding freehold site for the erection of a Mission Church in a large and necessitous quarter of his parish.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Coles, Rev. R. E., Vicar of Halestown, Cornwall ; Rector of Corsley.
Collinson, Rev. Samuel Edward, Curate of the Parish Church, Preston ; Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist's, Broughton, near Preston.
Dale, Rev. Reginald Francis, M.A., Rector of Bletchingdon, Oxon.
Dart, Rev. J., D.C.L., Honorary Canon of Nova Scotia ; Organising Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for the Diocese of Manchester.
Ferguson, Rev. John, M.A , Incumbent of Elgin ; Dean of the United Diocese of Moray, Ross, and Caithness.
Ford, Rev. Alfred William, Curate-in-Charge of St. Sidwell's, Exeter.
Hodgson, Rev. Henry Bernard, Vicar of Staverton ; Vicar of Thornbury.
Horner, Rev. G. J. D., M.A., Curate of Shenton, Nuneaton ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Margaret's, Hornby, near Lancaster.
Jane, Rev. John, late Curate of St. Mary Major, Exeter ; Vicar of Up Ottery.
Lethbridge, Rev. J. K., M.A., Chaplain to H.M.'s Forces, Fourth Class ; Chaplain to H.M.'s Forces, Third Class.
Little, Rev. Charles Edward, Vicar of Mapperley, Derbyshire.
Morgan, Rev. John, B.A., Rector of Llandudno.
Pargiter, Rev. Robert, Vicar of Towersey, Bucks.
Pearse, Rev. Edward Arthur, A.K.C., Curate-in-Charge of Buckerell.
Pigou, Rev. F., Vicar of Halifax ; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
Sandberg, Rev. S. L. Graham, Curate of Christ Church, South Hackney ; Chaplain at Bengal.
Smart, Rev. David Colquhoun, Vicar of Keelby.
Smith, Rev. Edward, B.A., late Curate of St. Jude's Conventional Mission District, Newcastle ; Vicar of Cullercoats.
Thomas, Rev. D. L., Vicar of Cameringham ; Vicar of Talland, Cornwall.
Waters, Rev. T., Vicar of Thornbury ; Vicar of Staverton, Northamptonshire.
Weston, Rev Frank H., M.A., Curate of Brotton ; Assistant-Inspector of Schools, Diocese of Worcester.
Wheeler, Rev. R. F., M.A., late Vicar of Cullercoats ; Vicar of Doddington.
Winckley, Rev. Charles Richard Thorold, M.A., late Curate of Isleworth, Middlesex ; Senior Assistant-Chaplain at the British Embassy Church, Rue d'Aguesseau, Paris.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Davy, Rev. Charles Raikes, J.P., of Tracy Park, Gloucestershire, at Gloucester, on the 25th ult., aged 67.
Howson, Rev. John Saul, D.D., Dean of Chester, at Bournemouth, on the 15th ult.
Hulton, Rev. William, M.A., of Watlington, son of the Rev. W. P. Hulton, of Barnfield, Weston, Southampton, at 45, Lancaster Gate, on the 24th ult., aged 42.
Main, Rev. Thomas John, for thirty-four years Professor of the Royal Naval College, Portsmouth, late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Senior Wrangler and First Smith's Prizeman in 1838, at 15, Elsworthy Road, London, N.W., on the 28th ult.
Probyn, Rev. Edmund Thomas Webb, eldest son of the late Rev. E. Probyn, Vicar of Longhope and Abenhall, on the 30th ult., aged 63.
Serjeantson, Rev. J. J., Rector of St. Michael's, Lichfield, on the 1st inst., aged 50.
Thomas, Rev. James, M.A., formerly Captain 60th Rifles, and late Vicar of Lingfield, Surrey, at Montague House, Vanburg Park, Blackheath, on the 4th inst., aged 83.
Watson, Rev. John, Rector of Orton Longueville, at Orton Longueville, on the 3rd inst., aged 76.
Woodman, Rev. John Sibley, Rector of Spetisbury-cum-Charlton-Marshall, at Spetisbury Rectory, Blandford, on the 30th ult., aged 69.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## CIRCUMSPECTION.

By the Rev. G. JANNINGS, M.A., Rector of Warmsworth-cum-Edlington, Yorkshire.

Sermon Preached in the Parish Church, Conisborough, on Sunday, October 25th, 1885.

"See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools but as wise, redeeming the time because the days are evil."—Ephes. v. 15.

THERE is a path along a mountain-side in the valley of Chamounix in Switzerland, which is called in the language of the country the *Mauvais Pas*, *i.e.*, the bad or dangerous path. The hardy mountaineer would regard it as a trifle, but the ordinary traveller would scarcely venture along it, were it not for the help afforded here and there in the more dangerous places by iron railings let into the solid rock. In almost any part of it, a slip would be attended by serious if not fatal injury. I once walked along it, and I did so with the utmost caution; I walked circumspectly, because I knew that careless walking would be dangerous. And the only reason which can be given why so many persons walk the path of life without taking heed to their steps, live and act with regard to the laws of God and the things of another life, without thought and watchfulness, without laying down a settled principle of action—the only reason to be given why men in a spiritual sense do not walk circumspectly is, that they are insensible of danger. We all know, of course, or might know if we took the trouble to think about the matter, that we are exposed to temptation and are liable to fall into evil ways, to form bad habits, to become indifferent to God and careless about heavenly things; but the fact is that a great number of persons who are nominally Christians do not take the trouble to think seriously, and are not watchful over themselves, and do not walk circumspectly. The word circumspectly is derived from a Latin word which means to look around. And how many there are who in a spiritual sense do not look around, and are not awake to the need of caution. They do not remember and take heed in their youth to the warning words of the Psalmist, "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? Even by ruling himself after Thy Word." And hence they are led to form bad habits through the force of circumstances and the example of others, without stopping to consider whether the habit is a good one, and one that is likely to conduce to their happiness and welfare; and we are to such a great extent creatures of habit that it is of the very greatest consequence to us to take care, especially in early life, what sort of habits we form.

A young lad, *e.g.*, in a country parish, when he has left school, and becomes to some extent his own master—his own master, at any rate, so far as regards the disposal of his leisure time—may either continue to go to Church on Sunday, and avail himself of any opportunity which may be afforded to him of further instruction in Divine things; or he may choose to spend his Sundays in idle lounging, in pleasure-seeking, or in something worse, and consider himself too much of a man to attend a Bible class or a night school, or to make any effort at self-improvement.

A course like this is almost certain to end in his becoming utterly careless and hardened. The habit of neglect and indifference to religion will grow upon him, and he is likely enough to fall a victim to some one or other of the more dangerous of Satan's snares.

Take the sadly common case of habits of intemperance. Men fall into such habits through not laying down for themselves a principle of action, through not living by rule, through not walking circumspectly. It is highly necessary in a matter of this sort, seeing how great is the need of caution, and how many and grievous are the evils which spring from intemperance, to have a settled principle of action, and to adhere very closely to it. They are certainly on the safe side who abstain altogether from intoxicating drink; but no one is safe who lays down for himself no rule at all, and who is not alive to the need of caution and self-restraint.

There is another matter with regard to which there is need of great caution—another snare into which young men, and young women too, are liable to fall. We are taught, in the Catechism of our childhood, that it is our duty to keep our bodies not only in soberness and temperance, but also in chastity. How many and great are the sins committed in this land against the Seventh Commandment. It was said, not long ago, by one who is well acquainted with the state of things in our great cities and towns, "The twin-sister vices of intemperance and impurity are coiling, viper-like, round the heart of England, poisoning and polluting all its nobler life." Great, therefore, is the need of circumspection in this matter. Young men should be circumspect as regards the company they keep; young women, too, especially need to walk circumspectly, to be modest in their behaviour. It is the want of circumspection, in the first instance, which blunts the natural sense of modesty, and paves the way for the commission of deadly sin. Thus, then, it clearly behoves those who would maintain a conscience void of offence as regards the laws of temperance and chastity, to walk circumspectly. Those, however, who yield to temp-

tations of the kind which I have just referred to know that they are doing wrong, and sin with their eyes open. But there are also hidden snares in the path of life, and the enemy of our souls is well content that we should be outwardly sober and moral, if only he can so entangle us as to prevent us from running the Christian race.

Through good education, through favourable circumstances and surroundings, yea, rather, I should say, through God's good providence and grace, we may be preserved from those sins of which an Apostle says that they are "open beforehand, going before to judgment;" but we are not, therefore, exempt from the danger of falling, and from the need of caution.

I will just indicate, for the sake of distinctness, two or three ways in which, as it appears to me, it behoves us to "walk circumspectly." We need to be circumspect—(1) In the choice of our friends; (2) In the formation of our opinions; and, above all, (3) in the general aim and plan of our lives.

1. As regards the choice of friends. There are many persons, no doubt, into whose society we are thrown, not by our own choice, but by circumstances over which we have no control; but the influence for good or evil exercised over us by these involuntary companionships, is small indeed compared with that which is brought to bear upon us by those whom we choose as our friends and companions. How sad it is sometimes to see a young man or a young woman, whose earlier years gave promise of better things, led astray from the path of duty and from sobriety of conduct through the influence of some associate, whose society and whose bad example and influence, if they had been more careful and circumspect in the first instance, they might easily have avoided. It is much easier to keep clear of an undesirable connection or acquaintance than to break off an acquaintanceship when it has once been formed, It is not to be expected—indeed, it is scarcely to be desired—that a young person should narrowly scan the conduct of every casual acquaintance, and keep aloof from the society of those who live around him, from fear of contamination. He might thus avoid one evil only to fall into a greater; he might thus escape the contagion of a bad example, but become entangled in the snare of self-conceit and spiritual pride; but when it becomes a question of forming intimate relations, of choosing the associates of our leisure hours, the companion of our walks, still more, when a young person takes the important step of choosing a companion and a partner for life, it is of the utmost importance to be circumspect, for we almost unconsciously become like-minded with those who live with us, and with whom we chiefly associate. It is commonly said that a man may be known by the company he keeps. Hence, in making choice of our friends, character is the first thing to be considered. And surely it would not be difficult for any young person to exercise so much of circumspection in the choice of his or her friends, as to refrain from forming any intimate acquaintance with those who show by their manner of life and by their conversation, that they have no regard for religion and no fear of God before their eyes. They might certainly do this without any assumption of superior goodness, without manifesting anything of the hateful spirit of the Pharisee, which says—"Stand off, for I am holier than thou."

2. Another respect in which I said just now it behoves us to be circumspect, is in the formation of our opinions. I speak here and now chiefly of our religious opinions. Now, no one who is at all acquainted with the history of religious opinion can fail to have noticed that on certain questions there have been, from time to time, marked periods of change and re-action. Thus, at the reformation of religion in this country, when the English Church and nation renounced the errors and superstitions which had crept into the Church during the Middle Ages, a violent re-action set in, which ended, in the seventeenth century, in the temporary disestablishment, so to say, of the Church and the dissolution of the monarchy—an experiment which, it is to be hoped, the experience of the past will not induce the nation to repeat. It was tried two centuries ago, and the people of this country soon tired of that state of things. They found themselves involved in worse evils than those which they sought to remove, and they gladly restored both Church and King.

There are those, however, in these days (and they are no inconsiderable number, and hold positions of great authority and influence), who would fain persuade the people of England to disinherit their national Church. A society has long existed called the Liberation Society, which in the first instance put forth the hypocritical pretence that its aim was to benefit the Church of England by liberating her from State control; but it no longer conceals its real object—which is to overthrow the national Church, to deprive her of her rights and privileges, and even to rob her of her endowments, a large proportion of which have been given or bequeathed by her own adherents, and no part of which can in any true sense be held to be national property, any farther than the possessions of any other corporate body or any other charitable bequests can be said to be national property. It is only so far national, in that the nation at large is entitled to the benefits which it was intended to confer; that is to say, to a share in the ministrations of the Christian Church, for the perpetual maintenance of which the property was originally bequeathed or set apart. It is a mistake which no one, who has the least pretence to any knowledge of the subject, could otherwise than wilfully and dishonestly maintain,

that the endowments of the Church are extracted from the national purse; or (as some have ignorantly asserted) from the taxes of the people. Had this been a mere question of party politics I should not have thought myself justified for a single moment in adverting to it from the pulpit; but it is a question, not only of politics, but also of religion and morals.

It is a question of morals: because to rob God of tithes and offerings (a robbery for which the prophet Malachi rebuked the Jews in the evil days of their history) would be a national sin and an act of national injustice.

It is a question of religion: because, if the schemes of the enemies of the Church were successfully accomplished, it would seriously affect the spiritual interests of the people of this country, by robbing the inhabitants of almost every village in the land of the advantage, which they have hitherto enjoyed, of having a Christian minister resident in their midst; and it is difficult to see, under the proposed state of things, how even the Sunday services in our country churches could be continued.

The disestablishment and disendowment of the Church is a question which should be viewed, not in the interest of professed Churchmen only, still less in the interest of the clergy, but as it affects the religious, and we may say also in a measure, the social and temporal welfare of the whole community—yea, even of generations yet unborn. To confiscate to secular purposes the revenues which past ages, as well as pious benefactors of more recent times, have consecrated to sacred uses, would be a deadly blow to the cause of Christ and of religion. The famous German theologian, Dr. Dollinger, and the head of the Roman Catholic Church in this country have lately concurred in expressing the opinion that our National Church is the great bulwark against Atheism in England, and that the disestablishment of the Church of England would be a blow to Christianity throughout Europe. The clergy, therefore, do no more than their duty in lifting up a warning voice, even within the walls of the church itself against such sacrilege.

And who are they that would thus alienate, if they could, the endowments of the National Church? They are not only—not chiefly—those who dissent from her order and mode of worship; for many of these are among the first to acknowledge the great services which the Church of England has rendered in the past, and is still rendering, in a far greater degree than ever, in the present, to the cause of Christ and of humanity. Many of these are free to own how largely they themselves are indebted to the more distinguished of her sons, for their contributions to the stores of theological learning. Many of these are at one with her on cardinal points of doctrine, and would deprecate, in the interests of our common Christianity, the crippling of her resources and consequently the diminution of her power for good. The bitterest enemies of the Church are not those of a different creed, but those who have no creed at all—who regard our great Christian verities as fables, who would rob God of His honour and man of his brightest hopes.

Surely, therefore, a great responsibility rests upon the electors of this country in the approaching crisis of our national history. It surely behoves all citizens of this great commonwealth of England—those who have long possessed a measure of political influence, and those also who will shortly exercise the privilege for the first time—to be circumspect in the formation of their opinions, to beware of being influenced by false statements or mere plausible theories, to weigh carefully the probable issue of their decision, and to consider well whether it would not be wiser and better for the interests of the people at large, if need be, to remodel and to reform, rather than to uproot and to destroy. The question we now have in view is not one of party, but of religious principle. It is not a question of denominational, but of national concern. It is certainly possible that representatives might be found who would go to the utmost length which any reasonable man could desire in the way of improvement and reform, and would at the same time set their faces like a flint against any such revolutionary measure as the disinheritance of the Church of England, which would probably lead in the end to the overthrow of the Constitution and the Throne.

3. And whilst we endeavour to exercise our political rights, as every good citizen ought, with a view to what is best suited, according to our calm and deliberate judgment, to secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number; to amend what needs amendment, to preserve what is worth preserving, and to maintain the just rights of all classes, whether they be rich or poor (which should be the aim of all good government), let us never forget that we are only sojourners here upon earth, and that our true citizenship is in heaven. There is need of circumspection with regard to the habits which we allow ourselves to form, in the choice of our friends and in the formation of our opinions; but, above all, do we need to be circumspect in laying out the plan of our lives. It is in this respect that many who escape the rest of Satan's snares are often entangled and overcome. The main question of all is—not what are our own particular views on this or the other disputed point, what party in the Church commands our sympathy, but are we walking circumspectly—walking so as to please God—walking by faith and not by sight; are we making good use of our opportunities? This would seem to have been the sort of circumspect walking which the Apostle had chiefly in mind when he wrote the words of the text, for he says, "See that ye walk circumspectly, not as

fools, but as wise"—not foolishly trifling away your time of probation, but seeking after the true wisdom, that which can alone make you wise unto salvation—"redeeming the time because the days are evil." This phrase might be rendered, "buying up the opportunity." It is so translated in a foot-note in the Revised Version. There are golden opportunities in our spiritual history as well as in our worldly affairs—opportunities which once lost may never be recovered; so that the exhortation of the text is then, and above all, fulfilled, when we are living with a view to that world which is alone eternal and unchangeable, when we inquire the way to Zion with our faces thitherwards. Thus shall we be safe from the world's temptations, safe from the fiery darts of the wicked one, safe from the various forms of error and misbelief which prevail amongst us, and thus shall an entrance be ministered unto us abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

## THE NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A Paper by the Rev. GEORGE BLADON, B.A., Curate of Penwortham, Preston.

"In sundry times and in divers manners" God spake to the Israelites of old;—in other words He revealed to them His nature and His will, "precept upon precept, line upon line," just as they were able to bear it. If we rightly think of them, our Saviour's words to His disciples, "I have yet many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now," are universally true of all God's dealings with mankind. In a world where everything is done by "little and little," we could not expect to have a complete revelation written in Heaven and sent down to this earth in its entirety; nor, had it been, could men have understood it. Revelation is gradual, step by step, just as human progress, both national and individual, is from stage to stage. The life of Israel as a nation shows us this. From one point of view the Old Testament is their biography, and in many respects it is analogous to the biography of each individual Christian.

The earliest Book in the Bible, the Book of Genesis, gives us a picture of the birth and childhood of the nation. It was born on that day when Abram heard and obeyed God's command, "Get thee from thy kindred and from thy father's house, and go into a land that I will show thee." In that land the patriarchs lived, and there as children they learned the first lesson of childhood—namely, simple, implicit, and absolute obedience.

See for one moment the likeness between the chosen people under the Old Covenant, and each individual Christian under the New;—except we also become as little children, simple, trustful, and obedient, we also cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven. But the time of implicit obedience passed away, and as a child soon learns that there is a rough world outside its father's home, so God sent Israel into Egypt, there to learn the same hard lesson. But from this kind of lesson no positive good can ever be learned; like the evil in the world around us, it yields no fruit in itself on which man's spiritual nature can be fed, and in Egypt, Israel, like the Christian in this present evil world, learned only the bitterness of slavery, and to cry unto the Lord for help. God heard their cry and delivered them, but not by bringing them back to their inheritance as yet, for when they so came back, they would come back to rule, and none can rule until they have first learned, not only to obey, but also *how* to obey. Therefore, like children taken to school, so God took the children of Israel into the wilderness, that there He might prove them, and know what was in their heart, and whether they would keep His commandments or no, and might teach them also, before they entered upon the possession of their inheritance, that man doth not live by bread alone—as the Egyptians amongst whom they had sojourned lived then, and as the worldling still lives now—but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

Thus the forty years in the wilderness were to the nation what our school-days are to each one of us, a long and seemingly weary period, but ending, as all worldly things end, at last; and like the young man coming home, so Israel passed the Jordan full of joy, and hope, and expectation. Now the child has become a man, with all a man's powers and responsibilities; the inheritance is his, but by his own sword he must conquer it for himself. So is it in the Christian life; he who is no longer a babe in Christ, but a man in whom Christ is formed, is also a soldier for Christ, pledged (like Israel against the Canaanites) to fight manfully under His banner against sin, the world, and the devil, and to win the kingdoms of this world as one kingdom for our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

And so long as the energy and fervour of youth, vigorous and enthusiastic in the presence of its teachers, lasted, so long did all go well; tribe after tribe was exterminated, and the land was entered upon. Like one starting life under favourable influences, so Israel "served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that overlived Joshua."

And now we enter, as it were, on a second period. Israel, in one sense, is no longer a child, he has become a man, and has put away childish things; his school-days are over, now he must apply the lessons he has learned, he must think and act for himself; he has chosen for himself the Lord for his God; and God no longer commands him as a child, but draws him by the cords of a man—guides him, that is, by love, and reproves him by judgment. It is the crisis of his life; the two paths are before him, the two voices call him; but Israel chose badly. Like a young man forgetting his early training, so Israel forgot God; he would "see life" first as young men desire to see it still;—Israel "mingled among the heathen and learned their works." Swiftly came the inevitable punishment; very quickly did Israel possess the sins of his youth, and like the prodigal son, away from his father, feeding on the husks that the swine do eat, so the nation which had forsaken the law of the Lord, and would not keep His covenant, fell quickly into anarchy, lawlessness, and misery. Therefore he takes a decisive step—now the tragedy of so many lives finds its likeness in the one great national tragedy of the Bible. Israel has sown his wild oats, and likes their harvest but little; therefore he does as men do still, he turns unto the Lord with *half* his heart;—he becomes *respectable*:—"Make us a king," he says, "to judge us like all the nations." It is a great national attempt to serve God and

Mammon, a cunning scheme for re-establishing worldly prosperity by "religious" means; hence God's word to Samuel, "they have not rejected you but Me." God gave them a king, for, in itself, the request for a king was no wrong; there is no sacredness in forms of government as such. Moreover Israel is now, as it were, a man—"lord of himself, that heritage of woe"—and as a man, therefore, God reasons with him; no longer commanding him as a child is commanded, but teaching him by new masters, the prophets, who spake to the nation, and to its rulers as man speaks to his fellow-man. I do not mean that the prophets spake only as men; no assertion in the Creed is truer than the words, "I believe in the Holy Ghost . . . who spake by the prophets;" but I mean that they spake as plainly, clearly, and decisively, both to kings and people, as any one of us, if we have but the wisdom and the courage, may still speak openly to our fellow-men. Boldness is the characteristic of all prophetic teaching; there is nothing more striking—I had almost said, more astonishing—than the attitude of the Hebrew prophets toward both kings and people. They hardly seem to have known the meaning of the word fear; Nathan rebuked David in the tone that a magistrate rebukes a prisoner; Elijah confronts an idolatrous people as well as an idolatrous king; Micaiah, the son of Imlah, publicly exposes the falseness of the courtly four hundred. And their attitude is as independent as it is fearless, for while on the one hand the prophet Ahijah countenances a rebellion, Elisha anoints a military captain, Jehu, to be king, and Samuel displaces King Saul for David, the keeper of his father's sheep; on the other hand Isaiah was the principal adviser of King Hezekiah, and Obadiah the prime minister of King Ahab. No traditional rule is observed in their teaching; each prophet speaks the word of the Lord as an authoritative message needing neither sanction from man nor precedent from law; the message carries with it its own authority, and king and people must obey it accordingly.

Thus in the last stage of their life, as we read it in the pages of the Old Testament, we find God forming His people for Himself; no longer, like children, by commands which must be implicitly obeyed, whether understood or not; nor like youths, taught by lessons and by fixed rules and laws; but as men, able to see and to judge, able to shun for themselves the wrong, and to choose for themselves the right, able to see the results of the folly and sin into which they wilfully fall, but able also to know the good way lying before them, and therein to walk, and therefore prepared, as we also by the teachings of the Word and the Spirit are prepared, to know "the day of visitation."

---

A NEW see, to be called Sandhurst, is to be formed out of the diocese of Melbourne. When the arrangements are completed the Archbishop of Canterbury will be requested to nominate the first Bishop.

THE Rev. E. T. Churton, vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Dover, and for some years the senior curate of St. Mary Magdalene, Paddington, has accepted the bishopric of Nassau, in succession to Dr. Cramer Roberts. He was the second son of the late Archdeacon Churton, of Cleveland, Yorkshire; was educated at Eton and Oriel, and was ordained in 1866. He has been a very successful parish priest at Dover, where he has built a church.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 16, 1886.

## CHURCH REFORM.

LAST week we expressed our earnest desire that the Bishops and clergy, who possess very large administrative and discretionary powers, should themselves, without wasting time and temper in seeking additional Acts of Parliament, initiate useful reforms in the administration of Church affairs. If the object of reform be, as the memorialists say, to give the laity a more clearly defined position and responsibility in our Church system, we contended that the true remedy lay rather in administration than in legislation. Acts of Parliament, in these days of talk and obstruction, are difficult to obtain, and when obtained often rather prevent than facilitate the attainment of their purpose. Acts of Parliament, except, perhaps, enabling ones, are for the most part nuisances, *e.g.*, the Public Worship Regulation Act, with its absurd and injurious provisions of imprisoning the clergy for making a matter of conscience of their movements and dresses, and of allowing them three years' grace for complying with the judgments of the Queen's Court. We endeavoured to point out that the Bishops and the clergy, without any fresh laws, have ample authority to delegate to the laity and their elected representatives considerable power and responsibility in the management of the affairs of the Church. This may be done without any serious or revolutionary departure from the present excellent constitution of the Church. If the churchwardens became real representatives of the parishioners, and were brought by means of lay archdeacons into personal contact with the Bishop, it would be very easy for him to consult with them before committing the cure of the souls of their fellow-parishioners to an otherwise competent clerk. In this way another object of the memorialists would be practically secured, viz., "That no one be appointed to a living without previous consultation with the parishioners or their representatives." When the clerk is once instituted he enjoys, and should enjoy, perfect liberty of teaching, although we should be glad to see some restraint on the perfect liberty of action which he now has as regards the disposal of Church funds

and offertories; this restraint would probably prevent his pursuing an eccentric career, as regards decorating himself or his Church. But restraint must never be carried so far as to impair the liberty of a teacher, as is so frequently done in Dissenting congregations; otherwise it destroys all his value. The most common-place man, if he speaks truthfully what he thinks, possesses some suggestive or guiding power. But he who dares only say what will please his ecclesiastical superior or his congregation, is either a nullity or a misleader. Whatever so-called reforms may be initiated, we trust that there will be, as there ever has been, free speech in the pulpit.

Another demand of the memorialists, "That there should be a reform of Church patronage, so as to put an end to the traffic in the cure of souls," will require much careful consideration and handling by Convocation. It would do well to eschew anything that savours of clap-trap, sentimental, or panic legislation, in so important and fundamental a subject as patronage is in the Church of England. Let it give careful heed to the wise and weighty observations of that true friend of the Establishment, the Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P., who, in the *Times* of the 11th inst., writes:—

The consideration of the abuses which have sprung up in connection with Church patronage has been greatly embarrassed by the habit of stigmatising the sale of patronage under the mischievous and misleading misnomer of the "sale of the cure of souls." It is nothing of the kind; its real character will be discovered by tracing patronage to its origin, and observing the changes it has undergone under the inevitable influence of extended population, divided properties, and vicissitudes of fortune occurring to patrons of old endowments.

Whence, then, arose Church patronage, and wherein does it need amendment?

1. Church patronage is the right of presenting a clerk to the bishop for institution, if, upon examination, he be found duly qualified for the cure of souls.

2. Church patronage is a function adherent to the endowment of a benefice. It is legally transferable by will, inheritance, or sale, with or without the property, the possession of which enabled the founder to endow the parish for the spiritual welfare of its inhabitants.

3. The endowment of the spiritual cure of a parish is a gift to that parish for the service of God—a gift which it would be sacrilegious on the part of the patron to revoke or impair, with or without the concurrence of the people, the bishop, or the State, who is the trustee and guardian of the benefice.

* * * *

The founder of a benefice, his heirs, successors, and assigns were obviously the fittest persons to hold the office of patron while the property with which it is connected maintained its integrity, but with the breaking up of the property arrived the necessity of sale and the assignment of the patronage to persons, some thoroughly loyal in their duty, some seeking only an investment out of which they hope to derive a profit. Even, however, when in the hands of a worthless speculator it cannot be said that he buys or sells the cure of souls; his interest in the benefice is derived from the original endowment, and his privilege is confined to presenting a clerk to the bishop. It is with the bishop that resides the responsibility of committing to the clerk the cure of souls, and if the clerk be in every respect suitable it matters not through what channel his presentation to the bishop is effected. Unfortunately the bishop has not the power to reject with full legal authority an unworthy clerk; and to provide him with this power is the first object in Church reform.

A difference ought to be made between the sale of advowsons and next presentations. It is only the sale of the latter that gives rise to scandal, and is directly injurious to the instruction and spiritual welfare of the people. A case in point comes to our recollection. The patroness of a living in a large and growing district in the north of England was desirous of selling the next presentation. Negotiations were entered into with a clergyman, but before they were settled the vicar died, and of course they could not be completed; so the living was given to an octogenarian, and immediately after his institution by the Bishop, the next presentation was again advertised, with the prospect of "early possession." Thus the sale of next presentations — although not technically simony, which cannot take place without the concurrence of a bishop, for he alone can give either holy orders, or the cure of souls—is substantially identical with it. The purchasing clerk actually applies the emoluments of the benefice to the satisfaction of its price, and so a patron who sells such presentations, is virtually diverting to his own use a portion of the property given to God, and of which he is the trustee. The sale of next presentations should certainly be made illegal, and donatives should be brought under Episcopal jurisdiction. But unless religious endowments of all churches and sects are made illegal—and we admit that poverty and adversity have their uses in morals and religious advancement—we should regret to see private patronage abolished in the Church, because we are sure that to make over all livings to the Bishops, or trustees, or to the Crown, would greatly prejudice the welfare and the successful teaching of the Church. Private patronage has many advantages, and we know many private patrons who are most careful in their appointments, and whose nominations will bear comparison with those of the Bishops and of the Crown. Private, like public patronage, can be abused; we think, therefore, the Bishops should exercise a wise discretion in instituting the nominees to the cure of souls. Might they not lay down rules and general principles in discharging this most important function, such as, that no person should be instituted to a benefice until he had served five or seven years as a curate, and that the churchwardens of the parish should be consulted before the institution of the patron's nominee. This last proviso would, in a measure, meet the demand of Bishop Wordsworth and the deans, "that the parishioners, through their representatives, should have the power of objecting to a nominee." In many cases this would be conducive to the peace and spiritual welfare of a parish, for many a clergyman has been appointed to a bene-

fice against the express wish of a whole congregation. This was the case not long ago in an appointment made by the late Bishop of London in favour of his son-in-law, and more recently by Mr. Gladstone. This subject of Church patronage is so deep and so momentous, that it should not be dealt with in too hasty a manner. A wise and judicious system of reform is needed, so as to make the Church of England more than it is at present the Church of the people.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### DISENDOWMENT.

SIR,—I have to apologise to your correspondent "Presbyter" for misunderstanding him, and, accordingly, not precisely misquoting, but not quoting fully. It did not occur to me that he was speaking of Disestablishment and Disendowment otherwise than as applied to the Churches of England and Scotland at present. May I be permitted to make a few remarks?

I weave no argument, I think, at all; I state a case, already much more fully stated in Mr. Freeman's pamphlet. The statement assumes, of course, that there was no break in the continuity of the Christian society made by the changes at the Reformation. This is so in respect of the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland; your correspondent is wrong as to matter of fact, in saying that in the case of the Scotch Church there is no pretence of such continuity. Not only is that continuity uniformly assumed, but there are Acts of Parliament confirming the assumption; while the legislation concerning the Churches of England and Ireland in no case re-enacts, but merely assumes.

In respect of the endowments formerly enjoyed by some of the Colonial Churches, which were grants by their Legislatures or other authorities, and are therefore correctly termed endowments, not being or having been property, my statement of case does not cover them. The continuance or the reverse of such grants was strictly matter of expedience, and whatever may have been their expedience at one time, there can be little doubt that such are inexpedient now This whole subject is not new to me. I have been thinking of it for at least twenty-five years; and I have never heard anything advanced against the soundness of my views (not that I am singular in them) that is not based either on wrong historical data, or wrong conceptions of law (in its higher and scientific meaning), or on ideas of rights of property which are opposed to the existence of rights in it at all.

Your correspondent thinks that my statement "would remain untouched by the defection of the entire body of the laity." I do admit that I have not contemplated such a defection, which would amount to the self-extinction of the Christian society of England. Being, however, forced to the entertainment of the idea, I have to point out what would occur in that case. It would be analogous, I apprehend, to the death of a minor without a representative, which minor's estate was in the hands of trustees. I have not asserted any right in the trustees of the Church property of England to that property otherwise than as trustees. At law, they are its owners; at equity, they are its owners for certain uses; they are administrators. Should such a minor as I suppose come to die, the Crown would become his heir.

I am by no means sure, and I am not as certain as one can be of anything future, that considerations as to the essential nature of property rights will not be operative, at least to some extent, in deciding our legislators in their measures of Church reform, whether that reform shall take the shape of severance from Crown and Parliamentary connection, or some other shape. The logical consequence of treating corporate property as the property of the public is to treat private property likewise; and very often the consequence has come in practice very rapidly. I have more confidence in an appeal to sound and essential principles of right, in the defence of our Church from the threatened attack (is it threatened only?) than in the courses which we see now advocated. I may misapprehend your correspondent, as I have done already; but his advice reads to me very like this:—"Do your duty better, promise to be good in future, and we won't rob you." I do humbly think that I occupy higher moral ground.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

January 9th, 1886.

### SUBORDINATE CHAMBERS.

SIR,—Canon Crosthwaite imputes to me opinions to which I am most resolutely opposed. Permit me, then, to repeat that I advocate only subordinate chambers, Peers and Commons, to sit for two months at most, in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, for the purpose of local legislation. The Imperial Parliament, constituted as at present, would meet later, and sit, say, for some four months. I have proposed that there should be no separate elections for the lower local chambers, the English, Scotch, and Irish members of the House of Commons sitting in these lower chambers also. In the English Upper Chamber, all English Peers would sit, to whom certain officials might be added. In the Scotch and Irish Upper Chambers *all* the Scotch and Irish Peers would legislate. To them, in the case of Ireland, I would add (to conciliate the Churches) Roman Catholic Bishops, Anglican Bishops, and representatives of Irish Presbyterianism. The object would be to work towards a partial decentralisation; to avoid a large unnecessary expenditure in bringing all witnesses to London on Scotch and Irish disputed questions; above all, to yield a legitimate satisfaction to national self-esteem, without affecting the rights of the Crown, or the unity of the kingdom.

I believe that this would be a healing measure making for peace and good-will. As for an Irish *Parliament*, or the local rule of a *single* chamber, I reject such propositions with the strongest disapprobation. Ireland has fought and bled for the Empire, and *must* assist in its administration. If there are to be Irish local chambers, there must be English and Scottish also, each nation regulating its own mere local concerns, subject, wherever Imperial money is required, to the approval or disapproval of the Imperial Parliament. As for a single chamber tyranny, the idea is utterly monstrous. The hereditary and elective principles must work together. Without

the former, there would be no continuity of purpose, and no security for life or property.

I cannot conceive why so acute a mind as Canon Crosthwaite's should wholly misconceive my wishes. I value the ardour and strong faith of Irishmen, I value their moral courage, I value their eloquence (have we any Englishmen to set by the side of Gibson and Plunkett?), and I claim Ireland as an essential portion of true Britain. *Tria juncta in uno* should be our motto, good-will to all men, but love to our Scotch and Irish brethren, who have helped so powerfully to fight our battles and found our Empire.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford.
January 9, 1886.

## JAMES v. 11.

SIR,—I am afraid that, in my endeavour to be brief, I have not quite made clear my reason for thinking that comparatively too few of St. James's readers could have been eye-witnesses of the Passion, to justify his supposed emphatic use of the verb "seen," in contrast to the verb "heard," to describe the channel of their acquaintance with it. The question does not concern the proportion between the whole Dispersion at the time of this Epistle, and those members of it who had *lived at the time of the Passion*, and were still alive; but the proportion between the whole *Christian* portion of the Dispersion to which St. James wrote, and the number of persons in that body who *had been in Jerusalem during the Passover of the Passion*, and were still alive. It is only these last whom St. James could address with emphasis as eye-witnesses of the Lord's death.

It must be recollected that in any one year only a small minority of the adult males of the Jewish communities scattered through the cities of Eastern Europe and Western Asia, could have journeyed up to the Holy City for the Paschal feast. In a community of one thousand there might be two hundred males likely to make such journeys, and if a fifth of these, *i.e.*, forty, went up in any one year, that would probably be a liberal average. Half of these might be alive thirty years afterwards, and that would give, out of every thousand of the Dispersion, twenty surviving persons who had seen the Passion with their own eyes. But not all these were at all likely to have become Christians. The converts were but a very small portion of the Dispersion, and I do not know that there is any reason to suppose that the proportion of the surviving eye-witnesses to the whole body was greater in the little Christian communities, than in the Dispersion at large. If the proportion was the same, my calculation would give it as about one in fifty.

This is, of course, a very rough way of forming an estimate. I do not stand to the figures, which are merely guesses, and are only used to put the argument in a palpable form. But I think that they are sufficient to show that when St. James wrote, the members of the Christian Dispersion who had actually witnessed the scene on Calvary, could not have been more than a minute fraction of the whole body; and that the facts are far from supporting Mr. Murphy's version of St. James's words: "Ye have heard by tradition of Job, and have been eye-witnesses of the sufferings and death of the Lord."

It appears to me that Mr. Murphy has unconsciously done somewhat less than justice to the common interpretation. He has treated it as if it read the verse: "Ye have heard of Job's patience, and ye have seen *Job's* end." Had St. James written thus, no doubt the verb need not have been changed. But instead of saying "*Job's* end," which is an historical fact and nothing more, he says "the *Lord's* end," which is more than an historical fact, because it includes not only Job's subsequent prosperity, but also the Lord's merciful purpose shaping the trial and directing it to its happy issue. It is this complex reference that seems to account for the change of the verb.

PRESBYTER.

## GERMAN LITERATURE—A MODERN SCEPTIC.

SIR,—I take the liberty of sending you a few translations from the "Last Thoughts" of Heinrich Heine. They are not at all orthodox, but they are very original. Heine was born on December 13th, 1799; he poetically says:—"About my cradle played the last moonbeams of the 18th and the first morning twilight of the 19th century." He studied at the University of Göttingen, but in later life resided in Paris, where he worked as an author, and died on 17th of February, 1856. As a writer he is full of spirit, wit, and jest, and specially gifted as a lyrical poet.

### SELECTIONS.

The earth is the great rock whereon mankind, the true Prometheus, is bound, and which the eagle of doubt devours. It (*i.e.*, mankind) has stolen the light, and now endures tortures for it.

Thought is invisible nature: nature is visible thought.

The angel who paints caricatures is a picture of the pantheist, who carries God in his breast.

God has revealed nothing which points to a continuance after death. Moses also says nothing about it. Perhaps it seems not at all right to God that the pious told the future life so fast. In His fatherly goodness He will perhaps give us a surprise with it.

In ancient times there was no belief in ghosts. The corpse was burned, the man vanished as smoke on high. He went up in the purest spiritual element, in fire. With the Christians the body, as in scorn or mockery, is given back to the earth. It is like the corn, and sprouts out again as a ghost. It was sown a fleshly body, it sprouts again a spiritual one. It retains the horror of decay!

JUDAISM—Aristocracy.—One God has made the world and rules it; all men are His children, but the Jews are His loved ones, and their land is His chosen possession. He is a monarch, the Jews are the nobility, and Palestine is the exarchate of God.

CHRISTIANITY — Democracy. — One God has created and rules all, but he loves all men alike, and protects all kingdoms equally. He is no longer a national but a universal God.

The Germans embraced Christianity from its affinity with Jewish moral principle overlying Judaism. The Jews were the Germans of the East, and now the Protestants in German lands, in Scotland, America, Germany, Holland, are nothing else than old Eastern Jews.

Judea, this Protestant Egypt.

The Jewish history is beautiful, but the modern Jews injure the ancient, whom one would place far above the Greeks and Romans. I believe were there no longer any Jews, and one knew that a specimen of this people could be found, he would travel a hundred leagues to see him and clasp his hands—and now one avoids them.

The Jews if they are good are better, if they are bad are worse than Christians.

B. If I were of the stock of which our Saviour sprang, I would rather glory in it than be ashamed of it.

A. Ah that would I do also if our Saviour were the only one sprung from this stock, but it is from the same so many of the

ragged mob also sprang, so that to acknowledge this affinity would become very doubtful.

Heathenism came to an end so soon as the gods were dressed up as myths by the philosophers. Christianity has arrived at the same point. Strauss is the Porphyry of our time.

There are theologians in Germany who make an end of the dear God. One is never betrayed but by his own.

Our moral perception is in no way based on air; the progress of mankind, right, and immortality have a reality in nature. The holiness of which we think has a reality—is no brain cobweb.

Holy ones like the Stylite are now impossible. Here philanthropy would quickly consign them to an asylum.

The Roman Church mistrusts her modern bigot. She fears that such a zealot, instead of kissing the slipper, may bite her foot in extravagant ardour.

The Roman Church dies of that disease of which no one recovers—Exhaustion through the power of time. Wise as she is she refuses all physicians. She has in her long experience seen so many an old man die sooner than was necessary because an energetic physician wished to cure him. Yet will her agony last a long time. She will outlive us all, the writer of this article, the printer who sets it up, even the little apprentice who fetches the proof sheet.

In the dark ages people were best guided by religion, just as in a pitch dark night a blind man is our best guide, he knows the roads and bridges better than one who sees. But it is foolish as soon as it is day to still require the old blind man as guide.

How many a one has gone out to slander the Church and attack it, and suddenly has changed his mind, and kneeled down and worshipped. It has happened to many a one, as to Balaam, the son of Bosor, who went out to curse Israel, and against his will blessed it. And yet he had heard only the voice of an ass!

It will be seen by any one who reads the above extracts, that they betray a very sceptical spirit. It is hard to know exactly how much faith Heine himself retained. His own ideas of God must have been very indefinite, for he rejects the theistic conception of the best spiritualists, as being "a species of airless chamber in the kingdom of thought, starred with rays of love." He does not quite reject the idea of immortality, but treats it rather like Rabelais, as "a great perhaps." His only sound view seems to be his conception of the reality of goodness, which has been already quoted. To the same effect he says, "The good man finds his Paradise here, the wicked man here already tastes his hell." At times one would suppose he was a mere scoffer, but his thoughts are often too deep and just to admit of such an estimate, as being an adequate one. That he was no materialist is evident from his striking assertion, "I am positive; I have a soul.'

Having now trespassed sufficiently upon your space I must conclude.

COURTENAY MOORE, M.A.

## ELECTION—ST. PAUL ON ISAIAH, ETC.

SIR,—Given a certain series of historical facts or prophetical data, it is competent for the student or annotator, to deduce any consistent theory therefrom.

This is what St. Paul seems to have done, under direct inspiration, in his Epistle to the Romans, chapter xi., which throws light upon passages in all the four major Prophets and Zechariah, as will be seen from a few lines appended, with marginal references.

St. Paul's own statements, in turn, receive light from the earlier writers.

1. He treats of God's dealings with Israel—(*a*) judgment; (*b*) mercy, severity, and goodness.

2. He warns the Gentiles lest (*a*) mercy be succeeded by (*b*) judgment, goodness by severity.

3. He names the intervening period "The Times of the Gentiles," a distinct dispensation; the "Election of Grace" preceding the restoration of the Abrahamic covenant. "The remnant according to the Election of Grace," St. Paul instances in his own person, he being a witness to God's faithfulness, and a type of "the children of promise" (Rom. iv. 9-16; ix. 8, 30).

4. He alludes to a time when "the fulness of the Gentiles be come in" (ch. xi. 25), when the election of grace, exhausted by the Gentiles, shall give place to the covenant with Abraham (xi. 23-26), "All Israel shall be saved."

Thus he arrives at this all-important result, that the natural branches (awhile supplanted by the wild olive graft) become finally reunited to the good olive tree, and the prophecies receive fulfilment (amongst others, Isaiah xi. 12; Jer. iii. 17, 18; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24; xxxvii. 24, 25; Dan. ii. 33, 34; Hosea i. 10, 11; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, etc.). I have only given his arguments in outline, the references sufficing to follow it in detail.

THE KINGDOM OF THE BRANCH (ZECH. vi. 12; LUKE i. 78).

| | |
|---|---|
| David's throne may totter, | (1 Kings xi. 11, etc.) |
| Pagan Rome may fall, | (Dan. ii. 33, 34.) |
| His eternal Sceptre | (Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15, 18.) |
| Christ will not forestall: | (Matt. iv. 8-10.) |
| His mild Empire shall unite | (Isaiah xlii. 1-4; Rom. ix. 22-26.) |
| Gentile Church and Israelite; | (Rom. xi. 25, 26.) |
| Then for aye engraffed see | (Rom. xi. 23, 24.) |
| Native Branch in Native Tree. | (Isaiah xi. 1.) |

ELECTOR.

Christmas, 1885.

## CHURCH REFORM.

SIR,—You enounce the true practice, as well as principle, of Church Reform. We want no Acts of Parliament, except, perhaps, enabling Acts. Acts of Parliament for the most part are nuisances. What you really propose I put into other language. You advocate the restoration of the order of Deacons. Deacons are now sucking priests; they ought to be, for the most part, laymen. As for the restoration of the power of churchwardens, I am not enough informed to be able to understand how it would act. I offer a suggestion: If the offertory was always to be administered by the churchwardens, would it not be a great weapon in the hands of the laity to put down clerical impudence, ritualism, etc.?

B.

SIR,—Permit me to thank you for the sensible remarks on Church Reform, in your leader of last week. I should indeed like to see them carried into effect. This subject, which attracted so much attention during the Election, seems now in danger of being dropped, probably because the "Church in danger" panic has died away; and the good old parsons, accustomed to the "good" old ways, and for the time frightened into hysterics by the ghost of Reform, are now beseeching "yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep."

For this reason your readers have to thank you for re-calling attention to this subject.

An important item, not touched upon by you, is that of the present unsuitability of our Liturgy to on

class of people, *i.e.*, the uneducated. It must be acknowledged that parts of our daily service are not understood by a large proportion of an ordinary country congregation ; to use Mr. Drummond's expressive language, we might say our Liturgy is "not in harmony with its environment," and in consequence many of the class referred to prefer to attend chapel, where they can at least understand the words used. It seems to me, if our Church still desires to be the Church of the poor and uneducated, as well as of the rich and educated, it is absolutely necessary that an additional or modified form of Prayer should be drawn up, suitable to their needs.

The farm labourer has now become such a political factor, that for the sake of self-preservation, if for no higher motive, we must do our utmost to keep him in our Church.

T. N. DUNSCOMBE, Clerk.

## ROMISH LANGUAGE AND DOCTRINE.

SIR,—I am sorry to be again obliged to call your attention to the language of a contemporary Church paper.

1. In its answers to correspondents this week, it says, "Communicants should always receive the *species* of bread, etc." This is Romish language ; species means merely the appearance without the reality. This paper always praises Edward's First Book ; but that speaks of receiving these *Thy creatures* of bread and wine, and not the mere appearances.

2. This paper has a leading article on Bishop Ryle. I have no desire to defend his Puritanism. But we should keep to facts. It says, "The doctrine of Sacrifice is as plainly stated in the first Liturgy, and, we add, it is as plainly stated in the actual Liturgy of the American Church, as it is in the Missal itself." The only sacrifice the First Book of Edward holds, as also all the Prayer Books that followed, is the oblation of unconsecrated bread and wine. The American Church, indeed, seems to go further, and to offer, after consecration, the consecrated elements. The language is, "we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, *which we now offer unto Thee*, the memorial, etc." The words which I have italicised were not in Edward's First Book, nor in the Scotch. The American Church introduced them. They are an offering of the consecrated "creatures of bread and wine." They go beyond us ; but still they come far short of Rome, which offers up the Transubstantiated Body and Blood, with the appearances of bread and wine.

3. Rome says that it is not necessary to receive the cup, as the blood must accompany the body. This is founded on a theory of Concomitance. "The Altar Manual" (Palmer, Little Queen-street), says, at p. 125 :—

> Flesh for eating, blood for draining,
> Either in itself containing
> Christ, whom nothing can divide."

This is nonsense, as they were divided on the Cross. But if, as Bishop Andrewes says, that body, of which our Lord spoke, was a body slain—broken, and blood shed—then this theory fails, as death separates the body from the blood. Besides, "Drink ye all of this" implies the drinking of a fluid ; not the eating of the body with the blood in it. Again, why, in this case, do the priests feel bound to drink the wine, as if, to them at least, it was said, Drink ye all of this?

4. Great stress is commonly laid upon the fact, that our Lord's Body in heaven is a glorified body ; but, as Bishop Burnett says, "this theory of Concomitance will fail on that account." When we are told that we know nothing about the nature of His body, we may retort that neither do they ; and yet, as if they did, they presume to hold obedience to His command, "Drink ye all of this," to be unnecessary.

5. This paper lays great stress upon the words in the thirty-first Article, *vulgo dicebatur*, "it was commonly said." But he overlooks the fact that what the Article says, is "*missarum sacrificia blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciosæ imposturæ*," the *vulgo dicebatur* is merely in a parenthesis. But, at any rate, the doctrine expressed in the parenthesis is universally held. (See the titular Bishop of Salford's "The People's Manual," p. 114 : "You ought to get as many masses as you can said for your deceased friends and benefactors." So what the Article condemns is the received doctrine of the Romish Communion. Does this paper hide its head, like an ostrich, that it says, "its very memory seems now to have passed away"? Trent, Can. iii., anathematizes any who deny that the sacrifice of the Mass is a propitiation to be offered for the living and the dead, etc.

6. This paper says that it is blasphemy in Bishop Ryle to denounce the sacrifice of the Mass, because it is taught in Edward's First Book and in the American. But this is groundless. Sacrifice means merely oblation ; the oblation of the bread and wine, either consecrated, as the American Book has it, or unconsecrated, as Edward's has it. How any one can say that an oblation of "creatures of bread and wine" is the same as the offering of our Lord's Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity—this passes my comprehension. This paper boasts that the American Prayer Book has the word "oblation" in the margin. But what avails that? As Bishop Harold Browne says, Art. xxxi. p. 743, "First, the Fathers esteemed it an offering, or presenting, of the gifts of bread and wine, and of the alms of the faithful to the service of God ; secondly, as an offering of the sacrifice of prayer and praise ; thirdly, as a presenting of ourselves, our souls and bodies, and so of the whole mystical body of the faithful to the Lord ; but, fourthly, they esteemed it a memorial of Christ's sacrifice, a recalling of the efficacy of that sacrifice, and a pleading of its efficacy for the salvation of their souls."

7. But why does this paper fence with *obiter dicta* in the thirty-first Article, when it says that the twenty-eighth Article agrees with Trent, though it denounces, by name, the very Transubstantiation which Trent makes an article of faith. It may as well swallow one article as another. I am not condemning professed Romanists, though their creed is incredible. What I do condemn is men professing to agree with the Prayer Book, and twisting its words so as to make them agree with what not only they do condemn, but were actually worded in order that they should condemn.

8. Bishop Bull, quoted in Tract xc., says that all Rome does is for gain. We have a fine illustration of this just now. The Titular of Ossory excommunicates all who marry non-Romanists. But, lo and behold! the Pope, for £5,000, sanctions the marriage of the Prince of Denmark with the Romanist Princess Marie, of Orleans. All is venal at Rome.

9. This paper may snub Dalgairns when we refer to him. But the Titular of Salford quotes him as an authority; and this very paper speaks of him as second only to Newman.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—After writing above, two ideas occur to me:—First, In order to prove that the Lord's Body is not bound by the laws of other bodies, as St. Augustine says, we are reminded that "flesh and blood cannot inherit, etc.," but if so, what becomes of the Romish idea, that His flesh and blood are present on the altar as well as in heaven? Second, Rome calls the Eucharist the unbloody sacrifice. How so, if His Blood is locally present? I submit these two queries to a contemporary Church paper. It is noteworthy that Edward's First Book, so much valued now, orders all non-communicants to leave the church.

## DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOWMENT.

SIR,—Canon Crosthwaite writes in the PULPIT of the 9th: "Mr. J. J. Murphy denies that we had to buy back our glebe-houses, built out of our own pockets. *But* the Act of 1869 obliges us to pay for our glebe-houses ten years' purchase of the land on which they stand, including garden and curtilage." All this is quite true, only I fail to see the meaning of the word *but*, which I have italicised. He confirms my statement that we got the houses for the value of their sites. This was where there was no building charge; where there was a building charge, we got the house for the building charge, without having to pay anything more for the land on which it stood, and the garden and curtilage were thrown into the bargain. But if there was a building charge which exceeded ten years' purchase of the site, with garden and curtilage, we were permitted to purchase for the smaller sum.

When I say *we*, I mean not the clergy, for I am not a clergyman, but the Church.

Under the Act which disestablished the Church, every clergyman who commuted (and nearly all did so) received his building charge, less dilapidation money. What to do with the dilapidation money was apparently overlooked in the Act, but under a subsequent amending Act it was paid to the Church Representative Body, for the purpose of putting the glebe-houses in order after they were purchased for the Church.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 11th January, 1886.

THE Northern Convocation is summoned to meet for the transaction of business on Tuesday, the 23rd February.

THE Chancellorship of the diocese of Winchester has been accepted by Mr. Harold Carlyon Gore Browne, barrister-at-law, eldest son of the Bishop.

THE Bishop of Liverpool has, it is said, informed the Rev. A. H. Paine, curate of St. Margaret's, that he considers him responsible for the services, and has requested him to discontinue the points forbidden in the judgment of Lord Penzance.

THE Bishop of Truro (Dr. Wilkinson) has declined the bishopric of Manchester, believing that the interests of the Church, especially of the Church in Cornwall, will be best served by his remaining in the diocese of Truro. At Probus Church, on Sunday, Canon Harvey invited the congregation to join in hearty thanks to God that the heart of the Bishop had been so inclined.

THE Rev. Reginald John Mapleton, M.A., of St. John's College, Oxford, incumbent of St. Columba's, Kilmartin, and synod clerk, has been appointed to the deanery of the united diocese of Argyll and The Isles, in the room of the Very Rev. Dr. Noyes resigned; and to a canonry in the cathedral and collegiate church of The Isles, Isle of Cumbrae.

THE Convocation of the Province of Canterbury will be opened by the Archbisop of Canterbury, in pursuance of the Queen's Writ, at St. Paul's Cathedral, at 11 a.m, on Wednesday, January 13th. The Lower House will, on the same day (in St. Paul's), elect their Prolocutor. His Grace will then prorogue both Houses, to meet for the despatch of business at Westminster, on Tuesday, February 16th.

AT a meeting of the General Chapter of Lichfield, summoned by the Bishop on Friday, the following resolution was unanimously agreed to:—"That this Chapter, while admitting the present difficulties and defects in the Church which require amendment, earnestly deprecates any hasty or rash legislation; and would recommend to Churchmen the immediate and careful consideration of such reforms as it may be in the power of the Church to bring about for herself without appeal to Parliament."

ON Saturday the clergy of the rural deanery of Claydon, Bucks, met at Claydon House to present an address to Sir Harry Verney, late M.P. for Buckingham, on the occasion of his retirement from public life, after having served in Parliament for fifty years. The address, after mentioning some objects in which Sir Harry had been more especially interested, referred to the part he had taken in religious and philanthropic questions, and the hospitality with which he had always thrown open Claydon House for discussions on all good works. In his reply, Sir Harry spoke of the great value he attached to an Established Church, and mentioned that he had been among the first to attach his name to Lord Grey's manifesto against disestablishment. A special feature of the meeting was the presence of the Dean of Ripon, who for thirty-six years was rector of Claydon and rural dean.

THE following address, which has been signed by 584 clergymen, including the three Archdeacons, three residentiary Canons, sixteen honorary Canons, and thirty-three Rural Deans, is about to be presented to the Bishop of Norwich:—"We, the undersigned clergy in the diocese of Norwich, beg leave to express to your lordship our earnest desire that means may be devised by which effectual measures of Church reform may, with the least possible delay, be brought to pass. We may be allowed to refer to a recent address to the Archbishops and Bishops from members of the Senate of the University of Cambridge, as in the main embodying the desire by which we are animated. Without committing ourselves to every statement or suggestion contained therein, and not presuming to indicate precisely the steps by which the object we desire is to be attained, we are anxious to press the matter on your lordship's notice in the full confidence that your counsel and action will be exercised to promote, by a timely and sufficient reform, the true interests of the Church. At the same time we would respectfully

submit that a special meeting of the Diocesan Conference would afford a suitable opportunity for the discussion of this matter."

ON Friday, a conference, consisting almost entirely of ladies, was held with reference to the Girls' Friendly Society, at the Parish Institute, Bourden-street, Berkeley-square. The Bishop of London, who presided, said, the object of the society was to bind together in one community ladies as associates and working girls and young women as members for mutual help (religious and secular), for sympathy and for prayer ; to encourage purity of life, dutifulness to parents, faithfulness to employers, and thrift. A great many people did not derive much advantage from the society ; but they had the satisfaction of knowing that they were sharing in the action of a society which made an immense difference in the lives of others, and was of incalculable value to young girls in all parts of the country. Amongst the subsequent speakers were the Rev. J. F. Kitto, the Rev. R. C. Billing, the Rev. N. Davies, Mrs. Brook Davies, Miss Bowlby, and Mrs. Townsend. Several ladies testified to the improvement in the condition of girls through the instrumentality of the society since the beginning of its working. The financial statement showed that the receipts for the past year had amounted to £205, as against £185 during the previous year, amounts wholly inadequate to enable the work of the society to be carried on in a properly generous spirit.

THE clergy of the rural deanery of Derby have sent a memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury, expressing their conviction that any hasty and extreme measures of Church reform, especially in the present condition of feeling on Church matters, are much to be deprecated. They add:—"At the same time we believe, firstly, that it is desirable that legal effect should be given to the resolution in the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Church Patronage Bill of 1884, which prohibits the sale of next presentations. We desire to see the existing system of lay patronage maintained, duly guarded by the exercise of the Bishop's right to refuse institution. Secondly, while we reprobate any approach to the communistic principle of equalisation of endowments, we believe that in some cases a readjustment of emoluments to suit the altered requirements of particular localities would be beneficial. Thirdly, while parochial councils, voluntarily formed, may in many cases be of much use, we have no desire to see a legal *status* conferred on such bodies, unless the lay element, equally with the clerical, be made amenable to the jurisdiction of the Bishop. In consideration of the many important steps already taken in Church reform, we are of opinion that the above suggestions embody the existing requirements, and we trust to your Grace's wisdom to finish the present movement with firmness and moderation."

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bardsley, Rev. C. W., Vicar of Ulverston ; Honorary Canon of Carlisle Cathedral.
Bernard, Rev. Edward Russell, M.A., Prebendary of Coombe and Harnham in Salisbury Cathedral.
Betts, Rev. J. A., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
Boucher, Rev. Charles Escourt, Rector of Frowlesworth, Leicestershire.
Boyd, Rev. Sidney Adolphus, M.A., B.C.L., Vicar of St. Giles's, Norwich.
Bryan, Rev. Edward Henry, L.Th., Vicar of Hensall-cum-Heck.
Campbell, Rev. Norman, M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Camberwell.
Carter, Rev. William A., Rector of Worplesdon, Surrey ; Rector of St. Alban's, Wood Street, Cheapside.
Chancellor, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Derby ; Rural Dean of Derby.
Cheyne, Rev. Thomas Kelly, M.A., Canon of Rochester Cathedral.
Cooper, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Great Cheverell.
D'Alton, Rev. Eyre Stratford, M.A., Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.
Davies, Rev. Richard Banks, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of the New Mission Church of St. Bartholomew, in the Parish of St. Ann's, Nottingham.
Espin, Rev. Chancellor, D.D., Surrogate for the Diocese of Durham.
Hardinge, Rev. Molyneux Sheffield Crampton Fitzhardinge, Rector of St. Bartholomew's, Barrow.
Harper, Rev. Francis Whaley, jun., M.A., Vicar of St. Lawrence's, York.
Humphrys, Rev. Walter, M.A., Rector of Alton Barnes.
Leakey, Rev. Henry Palmer, formerly Vicar of Ravensthorpe, Northamptonshire ; Vicar of Ston Easton-cum-Farrington Gurney.
Lee, Rev. William Hill, M.A., Rector of Wymondham, Leicestershire.
Little, Rev. C. Hardy, M.A., formerly Chaplain at St. Petersburg ; Assistant Curate of Christ-Church, St. Leonard's-on-Sea.
Long, Rev. A., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
Manby, Rev. Aaron Lewis, B.A., late Curate of St. John's, Battersea ; Rector of the Quinton, Worcestershire.
Mapleton, Rev. Reginald John, Incumbent of St. Columba's, Kilmartin ; Dean of Argyll and The Isles.
McAnally, Rev. C. M., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
Mountain, Rev. James, Vicar of Towcester, Northamptonshire.
Sinclair, Rev. J. S., Perpetual Curate of St. Dionis, Fulham.
Tylee, Rev. Thomas Gerard, M.A., Curate of Richmond ; Vicar of St. John's, Richmond.
Upcher, Rev. Arthur Hamilton, M.A., Rector of Baconsthorpe, Norfolk.
Wood, Rev. Hugh Singleton, M.A., Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.
Wortley, Rev. Robert Woods, B.A., Vicar of East and West Rudham, Norfolk.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Belli, Rev. Charles Almeric, late Vicar of South Weald, Precentor of St. Paul's Cathedral, on the 6th inst., aged 94.
Dry, Rev. W., M.A., late Rector of Whitchurch, Herefordshire, at Llwynon-Machynlleth, N. Wales, on the 8th inst., aged 63.
Ferguson, Rev. Saml., Vicar of Tonge, Kent, at Dover, on the 6th inst., aged 31.
Goldie, Rev. Charles Dashwood, at the Vicarage, St. Ives, Hunts, on the 11th inst., aged 60.
Hamilton, Rev. George Burton, at Springfield, Chelmsford, on the 6th inst., aged 81.
Humphry, Rev. William Gibson, B.D., for thirty years Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, on the 10th inst., aged 70.
Jebb, Rev. John, D.D., Rector of Peterstow and Canon of Hereford, at Peterstow Rectory, Ross, Herefordshire, on the 8th inst., aged 81.
Luard, Rev. Thomas Garnham, M.A., Vicar, Rural Dean of Newport, and Hon. Canon of St. Alban's, at Stansted Vicarage, on the 9th inst.
Miller, Rev. Edward William, Retired Chaplain to the Forces, and late Vicar of Porchester, at Putney, on the 9th inst., aged 72.
Ogle, Rev. William Reynolds, at Bishop's Teignton Vicarage, on the 6th inst.
Simpson, Rev. William, M.A., Incumbent, at Trinity Parsonage, Melrose, N.B., on the 8th inst., aged 76.
Weaver, Rev. John Crowley, M.A., Vicar of Kempley, at Kempley Vicarage, Gloucester, on the 11th inst., aged 41.
Wills, Rev. George William Barrow, late Rector of St. Leonard's, Exeter, and Rural Dean, at his residence, 9, Addison Crescent, Kensington, on the 7th inst.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## HOPE.

By the Very Rev. R. W. CHURCH, M.A., Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on the First Sunday after Christmas Day (St. John's Day), December 27th, 1885.

"And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three."—1 Cor. xiii. 13.

"FAITH, hope, charity"—these, in St. Paul's analysis, are the characteristic elements of the Christian mind. In the technical language of the Church they are the three theological virtues in contradistinction to the purely moral ones. They have filled a large space in the philosophy and the poetry of ancient Christendom, as an exhaustive co-ordination of the distinctive qualities of Christian saintship. St. Paul, as we know, in enumerating them, makes one of them the greatest in order and in nature—"the greatest of these is charity." But it is a first and foremost place among equals. All stand together, as nothing else does, in the front rank of the perfections which make Christian goodness. All are equally indispensable in those who would please God and follow Christ.

The question occurs to us sometimes, more or less consciously, why hope should be ranked so high, placed on a level with faith and charity. We can understand why faith should be so singled out; it is the foundation of the whole structure of religion; it is the bond between the creature and his invisible Maker and God; it is the special title of his acceptance: it is the ground of his self-devotion and obedience, of his highest and noblest ventures. Still more can we understand it of charity; for charity brings us near, in the essential qualities of character, to Him Whom we believe in and worship; charity is the faint and distant likeness of Him Who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son to save it; charity must last and live and increase, under whatever conditions the regenerate nature exists, the same in substance, however differing in degree, in the humblest penitent on earth and in the adoring saint or seraph in the eternal world. But hope is thought of, at first sight, as a self-regarding quality; something which throws forward its desires into the future, and dwells on what it imagines of happiness for itself. And hope, of all things, is delusive and treacherous; it tempts to security and self-deceit; it tempts us to dreams which cannot be realised, which divert us from the necessary and wholesome realities which *do* concern us: it is the mother of half the mistakes, half the fruitless wanderings, half the unhappiness of the world. How comes it that such a quality is placed on a level with faith and love. What need of encouragement to what men are only too ready to do of themselves?

But it is not really strange that St. Paul should raise hope to a Christian temper of the first order. St. Paul was a student of Scripture and of the history of his people and of religion in the world. And what is on the surface of the Bible is the way in which, from first to last it is one unbroken, persistent call to hope, to look from the past and present to the future. Its contents, we know, are manifold and various; the subjects which it treats are widely different, and it is different in different parts of it in its way of treating them; it is the record of enormous changes, of a great progressive advance in God's dispensations and of man's light and character; of the long and wonderful education of the Law and the Prophets; its story of uninterrupted *tendency* is strangely chequered in fact; bright and dark succeed one another with the most unexpected turns—lofty faith and the meanest disloyalty great achievements and unlooked for failure, lessons of the purest goodness and most heartfelt devotion, with the falls and sins of saints; blessing and chastisement, the patience of God, and the incorrigible provocations of His people. In spite of all that is wonderful and glorious in it, it sounds like the most disastrous and unpromising of stories: and yet that is not its result. For amid the worst and most miserable conditions there is one element which is never allowed to disappear—the strength of a tenacious and unconquerable hope. Hope, never destroyed, however overthrown, never obscured even amid the storm and dust of ruin, is the prominent characteristic of the Old Testament. All leads back to hope, hope of the loftiest, and most assured kind, even after the most fatal defeats, of changes which seem beyond remedy. The last word is always hope. If ever it dies, it revives again, larger, more confident than before. It is implied in the very language and appeals of despair. Hope spreads its colours over the sacred Book, whose outlook and interest is always the future, which looks back to the past only as the ground and pledge of the great things to come. So has St. Paul described the purpose and effect of Scripture, for his words are as true of the New Testament as of the Old. It is to impress upon religion the temper, the obligation of hope. He may be said to have characterised Scripture as, above everything, the Book of Hope. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we, through patience, and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope." Over all other voices in the Old Testament, voices of command, entreaty,

warning, rebuke, threatening, of triumph and gladness, of sorrow and desolation, rises dominant the voice of consolation, the instant call to hope even against hope, which elevates and strengthens, as well as reassures:—"Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your God; speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."

Hope, I say—the temper and virtue answering to, and embracing great and worthy things hoped for—elevates and strengthens and inspires. This is why it is one of the great elements of the religious temper; this is why it ranks with faith and charity. It is one of the great and necessary springs of full religious action. There may be a faith almost without hope; a faith which believes on, though it can see nothing; a faith which refuses to be comforted, which will not let the distant picture of better things rise before it, but yet trusts, even in the darkness, to God's truth and goodness. It is the deep and awful faith of him who said, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" It is the touching and childlike confidence of the prophet—"Although the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines: the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat: the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls: yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation." But the human spirit can hardly stand long the strain of a hopeless faith; one or other of the elements will assert its supremacy. And hope is the energy and effort of faith; the strong self-awakening from the spells of discouragement and listlessness and despair. What gives its moral value to hope, what makes it a virtue and a duty, is, that in its higher forms it is a real act and striving of the will and the moral nature; and if any one thinks that this is an easy process he has yet much to learn of the secrets of his own heart. It is an act, often a difficult act, of choice and will, like the highest forms of courage. It is a refusal to be borne down and cowed and depressed by evil; a refusal, because it is not right, to indulge in the melancholy pleasure, no unreal one, of looking on the dark side of things. It is so that hope plays so great a part in the spiritual life; that it fights with such power on the side of God. For it not only receives, not only welcomes, not only trusts in God's promises, but it throws into them light and reality; they become to it not words but substantial things. It is on our wild and wayward imagination that the forces play both of fear and hope; it is there that we conjure up dangers, that we allow ourselves to faint and be dismayed at the prospect and omens of coming trouble; it is there that we look forward and see all that we have loved and cared for come to nought. And, on the other hand, hope, religious hope, is a deliberate counter-appeal to that mighty power which disposes with such mysterious influence of so much of human life. It is an endeavour to subject imagination to truth and reason and God. It is an exercise, it may well be, of self-mastery, to enlist imagination on the side of God, as the ally and enlightener and support of faith, to make it use its charms against dark dreams and terrors. And, further, hope is a great instrument of spiritual and moral discipline. "We are saved by hope," says St. Paul. Long waiting, we know now, is God's appointed order for the generations of men. There was a time when men thought that all would soon be over; they mistook God's way. With all the ups and downs of earthly history the world holds on its course, and one after another men are born, and play their part, and die. All kinds of changes, all kinds of fortunes befall His Church, befall us all, who are going through our trial time. And we are often tempted to be tired and depressed, out of heart, and out of patience. Ah! my brethren, shall we answer to God's purpose, who has bidden us hope, who has given us ground for hope, so amazing, so blessed? Shall we let it make us what it was meant to make us, cheerful, calm, even-minded, large-hearted, generous? Shall we let its light and its brightness wean us from the dulness and heaviness of an unhopeful temper, rouse us to activity and the zest and gladness of charity, when we are fretted by little troubles, or oppressed by great ones? This is the office of hope; this is what it contributes to Christian excellence. It is not little. If only we hoped in earnest to be what St. Paul and St. John hoped to be—hoped in earnest, as they did, for the future of righteousness and glory which they held up to their disciples and to the generations of the Church, we should know more than we do, not only of their joy, but of their strength and their goodness.

This temper of hopefulness is not only concerned with the great things of hereafter. It has to do with our feelings towards things here. There must often be much in the course of things which interest us now, to distress and alarm us: evils which seem without remedy, defeats which seems final, perplexities through which we cannot see our way, dark and gloomy clouds rising in menace over our familiar world. To hope seems to us then like deluding ourselves; we call it optimism, an instinctive dislike to pain, a determination not to see the cruel truth. And yet how often has it appeared in the upshot of things that if in the darkest times any had been bold enough to hope he would have been amply justified. What must have been the feelings of Christians in the fourth and fifth centuries, when just as Christianity seemed to have won its way into the Roman Empire, they saw the fierce northern

barbarians break into it, and the heathen triumph over religion and civil order? Which would then have seemed the judgment of sober good sense—the despondency which only saw the frightful mischief, or the bold hope which saw in the barbarians the seed of a great Christendom? Yet, who would have been right, and who wrong? Or, again, in the tenth century, when open wickedness and ignorance filled the high places of the Church, when all seemed so bad and so hopeless that men disposed of their goods as if the end of the world must come with the end of the century, if any one had looked forward, in spite of all, to Christians again recognising their high calling, again preaching peace and charity, and leaving all to follow Christ, to the return of a great intellectual tide of art and of thought, where now all was brutality and darkness—would he not have seemed a dreamer? Yet who would have been wrong, and who right—the dreamer or the despairing? And so of other times of confusion and corruption in the Church, when the powers of evil seemed impregnable, and the attempts of those who dared to cope with them seemed only to issue in disappointment, or new forms of mischief—amid the polished or superstitious godlessness of the fifteenth century, in the angry and heady disputations of the sixteenth, in the tumults and revolutions, the atrocious wars of religion in France and Germany, in the fierce cruelty, the depravity, the plundering greed of the upper classes, the depression and helplessness of the poor left without guide or friend, the insolent claims, the savage intolerance of rival systems and rival teachers, were there not ample arguments for despair; and would he not have been a bold man, who could put his trust in the powers of self-correction and recovery, in the living gifts of the Holy Ghost, and hope that things would not always be as bad as this, that the days of peace and mercy would yet come? And who would, after all abatements, have been right? "It is come," wrote the soberest and also the loftiest of Christian thinkers in the last century, "I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is, now at length, discovered to be fictitious." The ominous symptom has not certainly grown less ominous; but could even the calm and large mind of Bishop Butler have embraced the thought that with this, not diminished, perhaps aggravated, there might also come a steady growth of energy and fervour and deepening practical purposes in the Church and religious men, such as certainly he had not seen, nor could look for.

We are but short-sighted creatures. We see and feel so clearly what is immediate and pressing that we leave out of account all the subtle and complex forces, mighty and ever active though we do not discern them, that are, perhaps, in the long run more eventful and decisive than anything we can now see. It is almost proverbial how often the prophecies of the wisest and most sagacious—prophecies of evil and of good, calm and deliberate forecasts which seem to rest on unanswerable reasons, are almost ludicrously falsified in the event. It is unsafe to prophesy: it is more than wise, it is our duty, to hope. God's mercy has never deserted us. It has allowed the darkest hours to pass over us, the severest trials, the keenest and bitterest sorrows. His returning mercy has come back, perhaps, in a very different form from what we expected; it has not restored what was lost; it has not revived what had perished; but it has given us something to take the place of what is gone. He has varied the conditions of our service. But He has come back to us in mercy—come back to us in His bounty and quickening grace—come back to us in His manifold, His inexhaustible wisdom, bringing new good strangely out of surmised evil, compensating, refashioning, developing, adapting. Surely this is the wonderful experience of our most disappointing and disobedient and yet enduring Christendom. We need not blind ourselves to facts; we have our part to do, and must deal as we may and as we ought with what is dangerous and hurtful. But the God of Hope calls to us out of the darkness; and we are unfaithful to Him if in our distress and fear we shut our ears to His voice, and dwell despondingly on a future which is in His hands.

But to Christians all that here invites and demands hope is but little to that which is to be when all here shall have been passed and over. It is simply the most literal fact that God has set before us in another state of being, the most wonderful future, which is within the certain reach of every single one of us: as much, as certainly within our reach, as anything that we know of, which we could obtain to-morrow. This is the plain, clear, certain promise, without which Christianity is a dream and delusion. The life and destiny of each individual man runs up to this: this is what he was made for: for this he has been taught, and has received God's grace, and has been tried, and has played his part in the years of time. It is the barest of commonplaces; and yet, I think, to any one who has tried to open his mind to its reality and certainty, it must have come with a strange and overpowering force, new on every fresh occasion, like nothing else in the world. For it is one thing to look forward to some great general event, the triumph of the saints of God, the final glory of the great company of the redeemed: one thing to look at all this from the outside, as a spectator by the power of imagination and thought, and quite another when it comes on your mind that you yourself in the far-off ages, you yourself, the very person now on earth are intended to have your place—your certain and definite place—in all that triumph, in all that blessedness, in all that glory; and yet surely, to any one that will,

this is the prospect; this, and nothing less. You may put Christianity aside; you may say that such hopes cannot be for man; but, if you are a Christian, this in its utmost fulness and reality is what you are to hope for. Think of anything you most long for here; you see perhaps the day—weeks or months or years hence—when you shall have the great desire on which you live. So in all sober assurance and serious meaning the New Testament bids us look forward to that future which one day we are to reach. What will be those new conditions of our being, which are one day to be as familiar to man's perfected nature, as the conditions of sin and suffering are familiar to him now, we cannot tell. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." How could it be otherwise? How can we imagine that the experience of our short years in this life, strange and wonderful as it is, could be the measure of a state of being in which we are to be brought near to Jesus Christ, and are to share the life of immortality? It is shown in Scripture in figure and emblem—figure and emblem which blind us with their glory, even while they transport us with rapture—yet only in figure and emblem could such things be presented to the mind of man. But some things are certain, which we can understand even now. Then, at last, we may dare to look forward to being sinless. Think of what you know of your own conscience, your own temptation, your own falls, your own struggles for forgiveness and restoration: and then think what it will be, to have left all that behind. Then, whatever be the functions and employment of that perfect state, whatever work God may have to do, we shall have the will and the power to do it as the angels do. The divided service, the broken purpose, the double mind, the treacheries of the will, the blindness of self-deceit, the laggard indolence, all that now mars and cripples our sincerest obedience, will then have been purged away, and in all the fulness of truth we shall know how to serve Him with a whole heart. Again, the greatest, and purest, and most enduring happiness we can know here is in the exercise of the affections; there in infinite measure, will be all that calls forth human affections; and there, human affections will be raised to new power and strength, transfigured, purified, glorified. And then, in ways we cannot dream of now, we shall be brought near to Him from whom we have our being, God our Father, the ever-blessed and the all-holy, and Jesus Christ who loved and saved us, and that Holy Spirit which has been with us all the days of our wandering here. And those strange words shall be fulfilled which promise that "We shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is."

This, as no one denies, is what Scripture invites to believe and to hope. These are no idle exaggerations of rhetoric or fancy; they are the bare words of truth and soberness. It is what we are living for, unless we are living in vain. And with such things before us, with such things showed to us, can we wonder that the Apostle places hope, the temper that embraces this and rejoices in this, on a level with faith and charity? Have such things been told us for nothing? Are they things to be without a meaning to us? Have we, as we have the power, in some degree at least, of realising them, of projecting our very self, our character, our feelings, our conscious being into this amazing future, reserved and waiting for us; of imagining how we shall feel there; and can we have been meant to live as if these things were not? Is it not *simply a duty* to hope; a sin against God's high goodness, a crime against the order of His teaching not to hope? Is it not a duty, in solemn and quiet self-recollection, to put before our thoughts that unbroken and continuous line which joins this very present moment with that hour which certainly is to arrive, when we *must* be changed, when we *may* be changed into the spotless blessedness of the saints of God? You—you yourself—with your trouble, your temptations, your sin, small or great, your conscious weakness, your insensibility and ignorance—yet you yourself are one of those of whom, if you will, all this wondrous future will, must, come true. There is no blessedness of the soul of man, no rest from weariness, no refreshment after toil, no opening of the eyes to beauty never seen by mortal eye, no delight in goodness, no rejoicing in perfect love, no ineffable sense of the sweetness and tenderness of God's mercy—none of them that may not be hoped for—hoped for with all the warrant of the Almighty's promise—by each soul here present, with its identity unbroken, with that individual character which makes it what it is. And is that great hope to be practically all a blank to us?

It is not to be told how much we lose of strength, of gladness, and enlargement of heart, of power to do God's service cheerfully and happily, by not realising and dwelling on the great hopes "set before us." We let ourselves be blinded, fretted, disheartened by the present, because we will not look up and see what is as certain as the present, in the not very distant future. Many of us, to-day, remember with more or less regret that this is the last Sunday of the year; that another year has gone out of our tale of days. *Its* days are gone and will never come back; nor that which they brought and took away with them; the pleasant times which those days gave us, the glad meetings, the sunny holidays are gone; gone, with the happiness which its days wrecked, with the health that they have broken, with the old friends, the lives, some of them noble and precious ones, which they have taken with them into the past. Here, as at a deathbed, we feel the close of all earthly things, the inevitableness and the drawing

near of death. With us the natural thing is to look back to the past; the word that naturally rises to our lips is "Another year gone." It is natural with us: with St. Paul it is just as natural to reflect; "now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed;" "the night is far spent, the day is at hand." It *is* the last Sunday, and that must give us much to think of. But it is not only, it is not chiefly that. About us are the songs, and the joy, and the innocent gladness of Christmas. About us, we are reminded to-day, are the "bright beams of light which God casts upon His Church,"—bright, indeed to us now, but only the faint quivering of the dawn of that Eternal Day. We, at least, if we are not Christians in vain, can join the stern and awful thoughts that accompany the lapse of time, ample enough, indeed, to make the boldest anxious, with the deep and chastened sense of realities beyond it, certain, final, ineffable, over which time has no power, which are warranted to men. We can pass on to the great hope which from end to end fills the Bible: the hope which ennobles and gladdens our mortal life; such a hope as carried St. Paul in strength and joy through the long "daily dying" of his Apostleship, and burst forth in such impassioned yet most reasonable conviction:—"For I count," he says, "that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us. . . . . For I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

## THE PURITY OF HEAVEN.

"Behold, He putteth no trust in His servants, and His angels He chargeth with folly."—JOB iv. 18.

"Behold, He putteth no trust in His holy ones; yea, even the heavens are not clean in His sight."—JOB xv. 15.

"Behold, even the moon hath no brightness, and the stars are not pure in His sight."—JOB xxv. 5.

THESE texts are often quoted—perhaps few texts of Scripture are quoted oftener—and almost always in a wrong sense. Because they occur in Holy Scripture, and in a book of which the poetic inspiration is equalled nowhere except in other parts of the Sacred Canon, it is supposed that they must be literally true. Yet an intelligent study of the book in which they occur, not to speak of other parts of Holy Scripture, will show that they are not intended by the author of the book to be received as true.

The three verses quoted above are spoken by Job's friends and "comforters;" the first two by Eliphaz, the Temanite; the third by Bildad, the Shuhite. The primary purpose of the book is to show that, notwithstanding the fiery trials with which God permitted him to be tried, Job was, nevertheless, innocent and righteous; while his three friends, Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, though good and wise men after the goodness and wisdom of their time, utterly failed to solve the mystery of the Divine Government and the enigma of Divine Providence, and were not far from falling into the sin of "speaking unrighteously for God and talking deceitfully for him." (Job xiii. 7.) When Eliphaz, with the assent of Bildad and Zophar, in utter inability to imagine that a great sufferer could be anything but a great sinner, said to Job, "Is not thy wickedness great? neither is there any end to thine iniquities. For thou hast taken pledges of thy brother for nought, and stripped the naked of their clothing. Thou hast not given water to the weary to drink, and thou hast witholden bread from the hungry" (Job xxii. 6), he proved himself utterly ignorant of "earthly things," of the laws of God's providential government on earth; and he can have consequently no claim to be a teacher of "heavenly" and angelic things (see John iii. 12.) On this subject we are not left in doubt. At the end of the book we are told that God said to Eliphaz and the two others, "Take unto you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go up to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt offering; and my servant Job shall pray for you, for him will I accept, that I deal not with you after your folly; for ye have not spoken of Me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath." (Job. xlii. 8.) And among the "folly" of which they had to repent and be forgiven, was, no doubt, included not only their thoughtless, harsh, and untrue accusations against the pure and holy Job, but their stupid irreverence in saying that God's angels are foolish and His dwelling-place not pure.

The general testimony of Scripture also, is altogether opposed to the teaching of Eliphaz and Bildad on this subject. We are not taught much on a subject which has so little to do with either our duties or our faith as the nature of angels or the character of God's immediate dwelling-place; but whenever the veil is in any degree lifted, we have a glimpse of absolute purity and wisdom. Wisdom, it is to be observed, is the natural effect of purity. "The pure in heart shall see God" (Matt. v. 8), not as an arbitrary reward, but as a natural consequence.

In 2 Samuel xiv. 17-20 we read, "As an angel of God, so is my Lord the King, to know good and bad." "My Lord is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth." These expressions occur in the speech of the wise woman of Tekoa, and cannot be regarded as words of inspiration, but they evidently represent the current belief of the Israelites of the time, which was probably based on revelation. We find the same conception of the angelic nature in Psalm ciii. 20-21, "Bless the Lord, ye angels of His; ye mighty in strength, that fulfil His word, hearkening unto the voice of His word. Bless the Lord, all ye His hosts, ye ministers of His, that do His pleasure." To hearken unto God's word, and to fulfil it, doing His pleasure, are the highest proofs of wisdom in created beings.

But, perhaps, the most emphatic assertion of the purity of Heaven is at the conclusion of that wonderful book, which, though not the latest written, has been placed, perhaps by a true instinct, at the end of the Sacred Canon. "The street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass. And I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof. And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb. . . . . And they shall bring the glory and

the honour of the nations into it; and there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh abomination and a lie; but only they which are written in the Lamb's Book of Life." (Rev. xxi. 21-27.)

It may be said that in the Epistles we find a different idea of heaven. The writer to the Hebrews says, quoting Haggai, "Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also the heaven." (Heb. xii. 26.) And St. Paul says in a passage, whereof the true meaning is for the first time made known to the English reader in the Revised Version, that our struggle is "against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places." (Eph. vi. 12.) In such passages as these, however, the word heaven appears to be no longer a word of place, but a synonym for the spiritual world; and this is in no way inconsistent with the possibility that the last quoted passage may be suggested by, and may be intended to suggest, the conversation between God and Satan in the beginning of the Book of Job.

Finally, let us look at the common sense of the matter.

When Eliphaz and Bildad asserted that the heavens are not pure and that God's angels are not wise, they meant, as the context shows, to argue that, *à fortiori*, man cannot be pure and wise. If the premises were true, the argument would, no doubt, be sound; but the converse does not hold; the premises are false, yet the intended conclusion is true; the heavens are pure and the angels are wise, but man is unwise and sinful. Those who in our time quote Eliphaz and Bildad as if they were authorities on this subject are mostly persons who have a deep sense of the sinfulness of mankind, and use this grotesque argument in exactly the same sense in which Eliphaz and Bildad used it. They are so oppressed by their sense of human sinfulness that they cannot see, or believe in, the heavenly purity beyond. But this is of the nature of unbelief—the feeling that heaven is not much purer than earth is akin to the feeling that God is not much holier than man. "The (merely) natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God" (1st Cor. ii. 14), but on the contrary makes his God in his own image, and thinks that He is altogether such a one as himself (Psalm l. 21); and it is only as the result of a Divine education that he comes to associate the idea of holiness with that of God, and to believe that everything as it comes direct from the Creator's hand is "very good." (Gen. i. 31.) From this the conviction follows that goodness and holiness are the law of the universe, and that evil and sin are abnormal and exceptional. Whether we regard the narrative of the creation of the human race in the Garden of Eden, and their subsequent fall and expulsion, as history or allegory (and the latter is the present writer's belief), that narrative, and the widely spread acceptance of it among mankind, remain to witness for the truth, which the experience of thousands of years of apparently triumphant sin has not concealed or caused to be forgotten, that goodness is what may be reasonably expected in God's creation, and that it is evil which is strange. In a future life, though not in the present, we are taught to hope that we shall attain to know even as we are known" (1st Cor. xiii. 12), and that all mysteries will disappear. Meantime, while we await this revelation, let us not imitate Job's friends in permitting our sense of the sinfulness of earth to darken our thoughts of heaven.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 23, 1886.

## HOME RULE.

THE question of Home Rule for Ireland has evidently, in Mr. Gladstone's opinion, come "within the range of practical politics," as he is said to have addressed a letter to the Queen urging the matter upon her Majesty's attention as one of the first importance. Be this as it may, Mr. Gladstone is evidently most desirous, for two reasons, to bring this question to the front: one, that thereby he hopes to gain the Irish vote and regain the Premiership—"to clutch the golden keys and shape the whisper of the throne." The other, that, having been so prominent a leader in Irish political changes, he wishes to crown his Irish Church Act and Irish Land Acts with a measure of Home Rule. There is no doubt whatever that the crisis is one of great gravity. Let us ask, what has been the result of Mr. Gladstone's remedial legislation so far? Have his Church Act and Land Acts quieted and contented Ireland? By no means. This is a plain question of fact. Ireland is now more disaffected than she was twenty years ago—certainly more dangerously disaffected in the sense of being more united in a compact body of disaffection. What, then, are the probabilities that a third and greater measure of Irish relief, in the way of Home Rule, would produce the desired effects, which the former measures have so signally failed to produce? We confess we cannot see them. Mr. Gladstone is very unwilling to admit his failures hitherto, and is prepared recklessly to hazard all upon the cast of the die of Home Rule, and let England "*annex*" Ireland a few years afterwards!

Ireland, like Delilah, sings to Mr. Gladstone "the tender rhyme" of "trust me not at all, or all in all." What is the good of a Church Act, of a Land Act, without Home Rule? and what presently would be the good of Home Rule, if granted in the form of Local Government, without complete separation and legislative independence?

> "And trust me not at all, or all in all.
> O master, do you love my tender rhyme?"
>
> "And Merlin looked, and half believed her true,
> So tender was her voice, so fair her face,
> So sweetly gleamed her eyes behind her tears,
> Like sunlight on the plain behind a shower."

Mr. Gladstone, unfortunately unlike Merlin, not only half believes, but apparently wholly believes in the project of trusting Erin "all in all, or not at all." Well—does recent experience justify such trust? What does the action of the Land League or National League say as to the future of Irish Home Rule? The League is a Coercion Act of the most frightful kind; and if it is to be taken as a specimen of Home Rule the prospect is not attractive. How can any sane man with the experience of the last few years before his eyes prepare to fling the reins loose upon the neck of Irish disaffection and let it gallop unchecked to its goal? There are in Ireland one million and a quarter of loyal Protestants, and they are to be sacrificed to the clamour of four millions of disloyal so-called Nationalists. There is no longer any Protestant ascendancy in the country; but once grant Home Rule, and our League experiences teach us pretty plainly what we may expect. We cannot believe that England will really permit this to come to pass, unless on the theory of Bishop Butler, that madness sometimes seizes nations as well as individuals. We might expect a Home Rule Parliament in College Green to make short work of the landlords; and we are not doubtful how the financial affairs of the Representative Body of the Church of Ireland would prosper at its hands. The transference of the Irish Constabulary to the Home Rule party is mentioned as one of their demands; and this if granted, would practically put under their orders not merely a police, but a small and efficient army of 10,000 picked men, who are already capable of holding the country for England if properly handled.

If we are asked would not Home Rule benefit the city of Dublin and the country generally in some respects, we reply, under certain circumstances very likely it might; and if there could be an Irish Parliament in harmony with England, as for example, we might expect a Scotch local Parliament to be, we should have no objection to see it. But as for expecting good to arise out of a Parliament mainly composed of Land Leaguers, you might as well look for grapes from thorns and figs from thistles. If we have such a Parliament we may expect more murders, more depreciation of property, more injury to the Irish Church, more coercion and intolerance—in a word, the working of the Land League on a larger scale.

But is Ireland always to be held down? How will it all end? we are asked. Well, would it be better to allow a burglar into your house than always to keep him at arm's length or held down? We should like to ask Prince Bismarck his opinion of the situation. We have seen what firmness and determination have won for Mr. Parnell; is there no English statesman who can put his foot down and say, like Menenius Agrippa;

> ——— "You may as well
> Strike at the heaven with your staves as lift them
> Against the Roman State; whose course will on
> The way it takes, cracking ten thousand curbs
> Of more strong link asunder than can ever
> Appear in your impediment."—*Coriolanus.*

The Northern States would not allow the Southern to break up the Union, though it involved the shedding of seas of blood and the expenditure of millions to prevent them. Let England speak her mind plainly; if she means to keep Ireland, let her put her foot down and say, once for all—No SEPARATION. You may worry and agitate, but there will be no separation; no murders, no dynamite can effect this; nothing short of successful open rebellion can accomplish it. It is the system of government by party that has produced the present miserable crisis; but surely there are English politicians, though of different schools, who have enough of common patriotism and common honesty to unite for the defeat of this persistent effort for the dismemberment of the Empire.

## TRANSLATION OF BISHOP MOORHOUSE.

THE long suspense as to the see of Manchester, which had been vacant since the 2nd of October, was set at rest on Friday week by the announcement that the choice had fallen upon the Bishop of Melbourne. From our ten years' experience of him at Paddington, we should say that a more able, energetic, and business-like Bishop could not have been selected. He is a true leader of men; he is no opportunist or compromiser. He has the *fortiter in re* as well as the *suaviter in modo*. The *Manchester Guardian* says:—

"Dr. Moorhouse will be the third Bishop of Manchester since the constitution of the see in August, 1847. The new Bishop, by birth and parentage, is a North of England man. His father was Mr. James Moorhouse, the senior partner in the firm of Moorhouse, Rushforth, and Steel, cutlers, Sheffield. His mother was of an old Cumberland family—Miss Jane Frances Bowman, of Whitehaven. He was born in Sheffield in 1826, and is said to have received his education at the recently established collegiate school in that town. He graduated (among the senior optimes) in 1853, proceeding M.A. in 1860, and receiving his degree of D.D. upon his appointment to the see of Melbourne, in 1876. In 1855 he accepted the curacy, under his future father-in-law (Canon Sale), of the parish church, Sheffield. It was undoubtedly in this great parish, containing a population of nearly 30,000, that the young curate earned that character as an earnest, hardworking priest which has since distinguished his career. The parish was worked by an admirable staff of chaplains and curates, one of Mr. Moorhouse's contemporary chaplains being Canon George Trevor, of York. His work in Sheffield was multifarious, both religious and social. As a preacher he attracted large congregations to the parish church, and won the sympathies alike of Churchmen and Dissenters. Soon after he came to Sheffield the parish church underwent considerable improvement, the chancel being thrown open to the nave, and the result being increased congregations. The Church of

England Institute grew out of the Church of England Instruction Society, which was founded in 1840, and occupied a suite of rooms in Carver-street, Sheffield. In the year after he came to Sheffield (1856) this institution, owing in a great measure to the active interest of Mr. Moorhouse, became a vigorous and popular home of education. To the young people of Sheffield he made this institution—by classes, lectures, and in other ways—one of the most attractive centres in the town. In 1859 he became curate in a well-known centre of London Evangelicals—the parish church, Hornsey, of which the rector was Canon Harvey of Gloucester. His work there attracted the attention of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, who was then Bishop of London, and who in 1861 presented him to the incumbency of the populous parish of St. John's, Charlotte-street, Fitzroy-square, St. Pancras. Here, with a parish of nearly 20,000, he worked almost single-handed for about six years, though it may be mentioned that he was for two years assisted by a curate, afterwards a well-known Manchester clergyman, the Rev. W. J. Smith, late incumbent of St. Thomas's, Pendleton. Upon the preferment in 1867 of the late Dr. Boyd to the deanery of Exeter, Mr. Moorhouse was, upon the recommendation of the late Lord Derby, nominated to the valuable living of Paddington parish church. In this crowded part of the west-end of London Mr. Moorhouse was regarded as an exemplary parish worker, and was exceeding popular as an earnest and devout preacher. The neighbourhood abounded in good men of various views—Sir Emilius Bayley, at St. John's; the Rev. Daniel Moore, at Holy Trinity; the Rev. R. T. West, at St. Mary Magdalene's; the Rev. W. D. Veitch, at St. Saviour's; the Rev. G. F. Prescott, at St. Michael's; with all of whom the broad-minded vicar of the parish church was on the most cordial terms, and among whom, both as a preacher and parish organiser, he held his own.

"During the time he was incumbent at St. John's, Fitzroy-square, he was (in 1865) elected Hulsean Lecturer. These lectures were subsequently published under the title of "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Subject of Growth in Wisdom." In 1874 he was collated by Bishop Jackson to a prebendal stall at St. Paul's, and in the same year was appointed Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen, and Warburtonian Lecturer at Lincoln's-Inn, following in the last-named office another distinguished Johnian, Dr. Cowie, Dean of Exeter. Upon the resignation of the first Bishop of Melbourne (Dr. Perry), in 1876, Mr. Moorhouse, on the recommendation of Lord Carnarvon (then Colonial Secretary), was nominated to the Australian see. He arrived at Melbourne on January 7th, 1877, where he was warmly welcomed.

"Upon his appointment, in 1861, as vicar of St. John's, Fitzroy-square, Dr. Moorhouse married Mary Lydia, eldest daughter of Canon Sale, vicar of Sheffield."

HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN FOR JANUARY, 1886.—SELECTED BY THE REV. JOHN NAPLETON.—7th, Fifth Sunday after Epiphany. Morning: 33, 5, 7. Evening: 407, 299, 346.—14th, Sixth Sunday after Epiphany. Morning: 206, 313, 81. Evening: 82, 236, 52.—21st, Septuagesima. Morning: 83, 360, 396. Evening: 297, 428, 226.—28th, Sexagesima. Morning: 386, 273, 172. Evening: 385, 284, 28.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### THE IRISH QUESTION.

SIR,—Your correspondent's (the Rev. Archer Gurney's) plan of settling Irish affairs is excellent—on paper. Paper is perishable.

He wishes to do something towards decentralisation. It has always been thought that centralisation of administration is a bad thing, if carried out too minutely. Your correspondent's plan is to decentralise legislation, not the administrative parts of government.

He speaks of the great expense (if I understand him correctly) that railway directors, engineers, and aldermen of towns are put to, in attending House of Commons committees, as a "grievance." I am personally acquainted with a good many of those gentlemen, and I am positive when I say that they do not consider it a grievance to have to spend a fortnight or three weeks in London, at the very best time of the season, on public business. They do not think much of the expense of crossing St. George's Channel, which is, so well as I remember, eight and sixpence, and would in most instances be willing to pay it themselves, if the companies and corporations demurred. If it be a "grievance" to have to convey witnesses, etc., from Galway, Belfast, etc., to London, it is exactly the same grievance (*minus* the eight and sixpence) to have to convey them from Northumberland, Cornwall, and Pembrokeshire.

Mr. Gurney wishes "to yield a legitimate satisfaction to national self-esteem, without affecting the rights of the Crown or the unity of the kingdom." National self-esteem is no doubt a good thing, but it is impossible to have it before you have got a nation to possess it. There is no such thing as the Irish nation that people talk about. There are two sets of people inhabiting Ireland, the native Celts and those of the old colonists whom they have assimilated, and the English and Scotch settlers. These two peoples are almost perfectly distinct; they have, for the last three hundred years, been kept distinct by religion. To talk of an Irish nation is to talk of a thing that has never existed, that does not exist now, that most probably never will exist; but that, if it ever shall exist, will surely be a curse and a nuisance to itself, and to all whose fate it shall be to have to do business with it.

How is it to come about that the "national" self-esteem of the Irish shall be advanced by bringing the present Irish members of the House of Commons into a room in College Green, Dublin, by themselves, and giving them legislative powers? More than one-fourth of these Irish members are ragamuffins (I use the word in its strict dictionary meaning, *vide* Dr. Johnson). They form, say, only one-twentieth part of the present Imperial House of Commons, and are not savoury. If they formed one-fourth of any assembly, would it not stink? Self-esteem! What does your correspondent mean?

There is another objection to your correspondent's project. The people here (*vide* date) will not hear of it. They laugh at it now. If it should become serious they will do more than laugh. They will desist it by force, if necessary. SUBSCRIBER.

Armagh, 16th January, 1886.

## CHURCH REFORM—"FEED MY LAMBS."

SIR,—Our Saviour's first charge to St. Peter, "feed my lambs," may perhaps claim a little share of the discussion concerning "Church Reform." I once heard a Sunday School teacher tell his class a tale about some men trying to make an old crooked tree straight by means of ropes; and he explained that had they tried when the tree was a sapling they would have succeeded. It would almost seem that the Church should not only look about to see what reforms are necessary, in order to make the National Church more in reality the Church of the nation with respect to men and women, but the children should also be taken into account. The Roman Catholics are very jealous lest the children baptised into their Church should become Protestants. I have often noticed that applications have been made to Boards of Guardians for pauper Roman Catholic children to be transferred to Roman Catholic institutions, Is the Church of England equally vigilant respecting children who are members of that Church? A very worthy vicar once said to me, when requesting permission to hold a short service on Sunday mornings, for the very young children, in the school-room—"Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." Some 150 of these little children were supposed to "come unto Him" by having to sit in the second gallery of the church, where they could neither see nor hear the clergyman, and there to sit still from eleven until one o'clock, after having previously been in school from half-past nine. During the singing they were quiet; but when we came to the Litany and to the sermon, it was nothing short of cruelty to keep these "lambs" in church, where the "food" provided was only suitable for full-grown "sheep." I know some of these "little ones" now that they are men and women, and some have told me that they had enough of "the Church" when they were young, and have no love for her now. Some are Nonconformists, others attend church at marriages, baptisms, and funerals. "Feed my lambs." "He shall gather the lambs with His arms, and carry them in His bosom.', I fear there are many "lambs" of Christ's flock, who are not only not gathered, but who are not even sought after; and, when they are sought after and found, even then "food" quite unsuitable is often given them. Church Reform is needed in the way of suitable children's services, for I have attended children's services where even more unsuitable "food" has been given them than sitting at the extreme end of the church, and being kept quiet by the thought that the beadle or verger had a stick in his possession.

It is perhaps very difficult for the clergy to find laymen suitable to conduct children's services; and, then again, there is the question lest a "service" conducted far away from Church lines may not pave the way for the children in after life preferring the services held in chapels and mission-halls to those of the parish church. Anyway, I believe, Sir, that you will see that the question of suitable services for children is a very important one, and that there is need of some reform respecting them, and that, if held, they should not only be open to the children of the Church Sunday School, but open to every child in the parish.

ALFRED COLE.

January 18th, 1886.

## WERE EUTYCHES, THEODORET, AND POPE GELASIUS AGREED? OR WHICH WAS THE HERETIC?

SIR,—There is no doubt on one point, that Eutyches held that our Lord has only the appearances of a man, since His Ascension. He would illustrate this theory by reference to the Eucharist, in which, he says, the bread having its nature changed, retains only its former accidents. How do Theodoret, Gelasius, and others answer him? By asserting that his illustration fails, because the elements, after consecration, retain their *substantia*, οὐσία, as well as all their accidents. Romanists quote Aristotle to prove that *substantia* and οὐσία did not then necessarily mean what is now called Substance, but may merely mean accidents. But if Theodoret, Gelasius, etc., only meant that the accidents remain, the substance being changed, this was giving up the whole point to Eutyches. That is the very thing he asserted of our Lord, that His human nature is swallowed up in His Divine. As an illustration, he says that the same happens in the Eucharist. If Theodoret and others allow this as to the Eucharist, they receive it as a fair illustration as to what occurred as to our Lord's Nature. I want to know what was the ground the Pope took against Eutyches, or did they both agree? (See Pearson, Art. iii.) Perhaps some of your readers, divines and logicians, will show how Theodoret and Gelasius, by asserting a change of substance in the Eucharist, gave any answer to Eutyches, who maintained that the Divine Nature of our Lord destroyed His humanity. A controversy would be futile which ended in the Orthodox agreeing with the Heretic. Jeremy Taylor ("The Real Presence," ch. xii. s. 30) has the whole thing argued out.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

## IRISH CHURCH.

SIR,—I had not intended to continue this controversy about the above Church had not a letter reached me a few days ago from a clergyman in the South of Ireland, giving me a deplorable account of no less than six mansions vacant in his union; and as regards his church, he, poor man, has been confined to his room for nearly four weeks, suffering from bronchitis; the consequence was there was no service in his church the last three Sundays in December, nor on Christmas Day. In the adjoining parish to his, with an income of £370 for rector and curate, where a relative of mine is rector, although, poor young man, he is unable for duty, a curate being in charge, there were three churches to serve, but since the rector was laid aside, one of these churches has been closed, a second has only four adults to meet the clergyman each Sunday, and I do not know the fate of the third. These facts speak for themselves, and any one reading or hearing of them, would at once say, the Irish Church is surely not advancing but declining rapidly in that part of Ireland. With regard to the letter of "Subscriber," dated Armagh, I would say I know a case of a clergyman in the South-West of Ireland who has done acts in his church on a Good Friday, walking out of the desk when a brother clergyman was helping him; knocking a book out of a lady's hand who was singing not according

to his ideas; calling upon a policeman, who was at church, to remove the lady (he was so enraged that he walked out of church, and was not there for several Sundays). I had this from his own lips; the same clergyman named this lady from the pulpit in his sermon; and he so annoyed the respectable portion of his congregation by this most unseemly act of his, that they have since refused to subscribe to the Sustentation Fund; so that, until he retracts and mends his ways, there is anything but peace and happiness in that parish. The clergyman's income is reduced, and his brother clergyman, who lives there, has since declined to help him, so that it behoves the clergy to keep on good terms with their congregations, else they stop the supplies; and, what is far worse, the Church suffers, and dissent prospers. I would say, in reply to "Edmund Lawrence," I got the quotation from an article (I think by the Dean of Wells) in the December number of *The Nineteenth Century*, but the Dean did not vouch for its accuracy, not having had time to consult *Hansard*. I wish well to the Church of Ireland, and am only sorry such a dreadful scene as I have mentioned could have occurred. Had it taken place in England the Press would have been full of it, and the clergyman in question would very soon have been obliged to vacate his parish; but it seems nothing of the kind took place in Ireland, as he is still in possession, and Church matters are at a very low ebb there—in fact, a friend of mine tells me could not be much worse. C. T. BUCHANAN.

14th January, 1886.

## JAMES v. 11.

SIR,—"Presbyter," in the PULPIT of the 16th inst., has an elaborate proof that "Ye have seen the end of the Lord" cannot mean, "Ye have witnessed the death of Christ," because only one in fifty or thereabouts of those to whom the Epistle of James was addressed can have witnessed it. I think this irrelevant. What the Apostle means, if I am right, is, "Ye know of the patience of Job by tradition, and the present generation has witnessed the death of the Lord Jesus." JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 17th January, 1886.

## Reviews and Notices.

"THE SEVEN GIFTS."—Addressed to the Diocese of Canterbury in his primary visitation, by Edward White, Archbishop. London: Macmillan & Co.

THIS is Archbishop Benson's first charge to his diocese, and to the public generally, *urbi et orbi*. We turn to it with great interest, in the hope of discovering what prospects there may be of the man, who, without great achievements, was placed by Mr. Gladstone on the archiepiscopal throne, proving equal to the responsibilities which have been laid upon him, and the to crisis into which his lot is cast.

The framework of the charge is something of a conceit. It is founded on a text, taken, characteristically, out of the Confirmation Service, in which is found the familiar seven-fold division of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Upon this and the passage of Isaiah from which the words are taken (Isaiah xi. 2, 3)—in which, according to the LXX. and the Vulgate, the gifts recited are seven, whereas in the Hebrew there are only six—he founds a description of what he conceives to be the present needs of the Church, and the best mode of supplying them. It is best to dismiss the framework from our consideration, as merely adopted to furnish seven convenient pegs on which to hang ideas; and to proceed to collect from various parts of the charge the Archbishop's opinions on those grave subjects by which, at present, the public mind is exercised.

1. DISENDOWMENT.—Our thoughts are all running on this great question: so let us present the Archbishop's ideas upon it first. He repeats the familiar argument, that the Church has no property, and therefore cannot be disendowed. While the Church has an *entity* of her own, she is not a corporation, nor an owner. The separate corporations, aggregate and sole, the capitular bodies, the parochial incumbents, the episcopal sees, &c., are the owners; but the Church herself, as a body, possesses nothing. Even the institution of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and the establishment by it of a common fund, does not make her one corporation, nor an owner. These commissioners are still only trustees for a vast number of corporations sole. The property of these corporations, including the tithes, all proceeded from private gifts. It was never given to the State, nor has the State ever possessed it; but the State owes to it, as to all other citizens and their property, protection, security, and permanence of tenure. This reasoning, we think, is, as far as it goes, correct technically; although, virtually, the Church is a corporate body, and one of gigantic extent and power: and the property of the corporations of which she is composed is also virtually hers. And the State must deal with her as she is, not a mere collection of separate institutions, but one great body. As to the title to her property, that, as Dr. Benson shows, is the strongest existing anywhere on British soil, the various corporations which hold property having each of them had a continuous uninterrupted life from time immemorial. If the State takes away this title, it will shake the foundation of the property of every corporation and of every individual existing in the country. All this is perfectly clear. As the disestablishment of the Irish Church led to the confiscation of the rights of the Irish landlords, and destroyed the security of all property and of every institution in that unhappy country, which has been the first and completest victim of Mr. Gladstone's reckless ambition and insatiable self-esteem; and has, as its next consequence, shaken the stability of English and Scottish property, and spread a sense of distrust throughout the United Kingdom: so would the disestablishment of the English Church, if thatwere to take place, add an irresistible *impetus* to the downward progress, and render England the country from which capital will have to escape, on account of the complete insecurity of a once happy land which was the most stable and the safest of nations, and is now the most insecure. Never was the disintegration of a great empire, and the destruction of her institutions so artificially produced, and so entirely the work of one restless and vainglorious man. But we are wandering from our subject and reviewing Gladstone instead of Benson.

ORGANIZATION.—It has always been said that the quality which has procured for the Archbishop his high promotion, has been his skill as an organizer; and, in these agnostic days, when many of the prominent ecclesiastics of the period have almost dismissed

the idea that there is such a thing as religious truth, the whole of the thoughts and efforts of a prelate like our Archbishop tend to become centred on organization and ceremonial. We therefore proceed to consider his views on these two heads.

As to the former point, he has the strongest possible belief in the advantages likely to accrue from the multiplication of consultative bodies. Like the Romans, he has erected into an object of worship the genius of talk, *Aius Locutius*. He would have the Ruri-decanal Conferences diligently assembled, and carefully provided with subjects of discussion; and he supposes that these meetings advance through mutual colloquy the spiritual tone of the clerical order and of the people. We heartily wish they did. He does not see his way to calling an annual synod of the clergy of each diocese; but he has an immense opinion of the virtues of a Diocesan Conference of the clergy and lay representatives, and around it he would group a great apparatus of diocesan committees. All these he looks upon as Militia exercises or Volunteer reviews—the sole ground, in our opinion, on which these clerical evolutions are justifiable. In themselves, they are sheer waste of time; but, with a view to possible eventualities, they have their uses: they habituate churchmen to move together and to compare ideas; and they are like the staff or *cadre* of regiments, which may hereafter be filled up and made efficient. On the great question of the formation of a central deliberative body to represent the whole Church, the Archbishop is ambiguous. Perhaps, as a thorough Opportunist, he does not think it advisable to state his views at present; perhaps, he has not yet made up his mind. He sees no way of reforming Convocation, though he would be glad if such could be found. He has no idea of admitting the laity within those sacred precincts. But he believes—and this opinion of his will surprise all who are acquainted with the real facts—that a sufficient representation of the laity is actually in course of formation. His words on this point had better be quoted:—

> I am sure that you will rejoice, that amid all the difficulties which now stagnate round Parliamentary legislation on Church business, a consultative House of Laymen is being formed, whose eminence, whose experience in affairs, and whose intelligence in Church principles will afford to our province probably the most practical and religious lay council which has been ever at the service of any church, and that without impairing a corner of the ancient constitutional privilege and independence of Convocation as it stands now.

This cannot be a fact. If it were so, the Church of England, in all its parishes, would be conscious of the birth of this great and important body. The fact of its formation would be as patent to all the world as was the General Election of the House of Commons. We are quite aware that a nominal representation is being brought into existence under clerical influence; but the thing is being done in a corner: the body is not the creation, nor can it pretend to be the representative, of that great body of Christians who worship in the parish churches of England. Judging from the representatives chosen in the Diocese of London, it will be more clerical than the clergy themselves—sacerdotal and ceremonial enough to satisfy even Archbishop Benson. It is to be hoped that it may fall at once into contempt and neglect. Were its claim to authority and influence admitted, its accession to power might be greeted as *Finis Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*. A representative lay body should be elected, and conducted without any interference of the clergy, direct or indirect, with a lay returning officer, and a lay chairman, and with a total absence of clerical tests or qualifications of every kind.

3. CEREMONIAL.—Archbishop Benson is nothing if not a ceremonialist. There is, in his charge, one very curious passage, in which he identifies the non-ceremonialists of his own age (for whom he invents the new nick-name of Joannean Christians), with those Christians of the Apostolic age, who knew only the baptism of John (Acts xviii. 24; xix. 1–7). On this point he broaches a quaint argument, founded on a forced interpretation of a Scripture text, not without cleverness, but one in whose validity it seems impossible to us that he can himself believe. He goes through a mental process which he is pleased to call *thinking out* what must have been the tenets of these Christians; and he imagines for them the following creed, which is obviously intended to be identical with that of those non-ceremonial Christians whose belief and practices are so repugnant to his own pontifical heart.

> The Divine nature of Christ; His universal atonement; His resurrection; His unction by the Holy Ghost; the efficacy of repentance and faith; baptism as a vivid sign of forgiveness and access; resurrection from the dead and eternal judgment. These added to such universal doctrines as the fatherhood of God, and His creation of the world.

This creed is constructed by putting together everything that is recorded in any part of the New Testament to have been said at any time by John the Baptist, and by assuming that his disciples must have heard, remembered, and believed every saying of their teacher. Amongst its imaginary articles, our readers will observe that the Archbishop places a belief in the Holy Ghost, although these Christians are expressely said never to have even heard of that divine Person. This result is obtained by assuming that these persons must have heard and remembered those words of the Baptist, in which he informed some of his interviewers that he had recognised Christ by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Him. Suppose this method of reasoning were applied to an ex-pupil of Wellington College, who had enjoyed the privilege of listening to the discourses of the late master of that famous place of education, and the unfortunate man were expected to remember, and believe, and perhaps be examined in, all that this eminent pedagogue had ever spoken or written, would not the test be felt to be a cruel one, even in these days of educational over-pressure? Yet such a test has the Primate applied to his twelve Joanneans.

It is also curious that, on the sacramental question, the one evil that calls from him repeated protests is—evening communion; which he pairs with the "element worship" of the Church of Rome—the gnat with the camel.

On the whole, neither the charge, nor the man, is up to the great position which each occupies. A man may be, as the Archbishop is, an excellent organizer, an accomplished scholar, a man of elegant æsthetic tastes, a pious and devout man, though with a strong tendency to class little things with great ones—the gnat with the camel, the reed with the oak. A man may be all these things, and yet only an *homunculus*, not of sufficient moral stature to bear himself worthily in the day of great crisis, when the towers are falling. Not only the Church of England, but all the churches, and Christianity itself, have to contend for their very existence; and it is not leaders, like the æsthetic Benson, who re-introduced the crozier, or the heroic

King, who replaced the mitre on his own sacred head —organizers—ceremonialists—decorators—who can rise to the level of the immense responsibilities of a chief pastor of the present time. "O Israel, thy prophets are like the foxes in the deserts. They have not gone up into the gaps; neither made up the hedge for the house of Israel to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord. They have seen vanity and lying divination, saying, The Lord saith: and the Lord hath not sent them."

AT the late election for the Archdeaconry of London a poll, demanded on behalf of the Rev. R. J. Suckling, was refused by the Archdeacon on the ground that Mr. Suckling had not expressed his willingness to serve the office if elected. As it was felt that a refusal to allow the poll, unless the demand for it was repudiated by Mr. Suckling, was illegal, a statement of the facts was sent to the Bishop by the proposer and seconder of Mr. Suckling—the Rev. J. L. Fish, rector of St. Margaret Pattens, and the Rev. R. Eling Green, perpetual curate of St. Olave's, Mile-end—for his information and opinion, but not with a view of pressing for a poll or a fresh election. In reply, his Lordship states that he is advised that a decision on the subject would rest with the president or Upper House.

THE consecration of Lord Alwyne Compton has been definitely fixed to take place at St. Paul's on Tuesday, the 2nd of February; and it is particularly requested that applications for the reserved portion of the Cathedral may be made direct to the Bishop-elect, and not to the Dean and Chapter.

THE deanery of Worcester, which is vacated by Lord Alwyne, has been conferred upon the Rev. John Gott, vicar of Leeds. Dr. Gott graduated from Brasenose in 1853, and was ordained four years later. He was curate of St. Nicholas', Yarmouth (1857-61), minister of St. Andrew's, in the same town (1861-66), and perpetual curate of Bramley, Leeds (1866-73), when he was appointed to the vicarage of that town in succession to Dr. Woodford, whom Lord Alwyne Compton is following to Ely.

THE Rev. W. A. Mathews, vicar of St. Lawrence, Appleby, has been collated by the Bishop of Carlisle to an honorary canonry. Mr. Mathews was recently elected Proctor for the archdeaconry of Carlisle.

THE Hon. and Rev. Francis E. C. Byng, vicar of St. Peter's, Cranley-gardens, and Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen, has been appointed Chaplain to the Speaker, an office which he has filled for twelve years.

THE Rev. C. A. Belli, late Precentor of St. Paul's and formerly vicar of South Weald, who sent an anonymous gift of £6,000 to the new parish church of Brentwood, has directed his executors to finish the edifice by building the tower and spire. It is estimated that this will cost between £3,000 and £4,000 more.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bate, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. John-the-Baptist, Dawgreen, Dewsbury.

Baxter, Rev. Henry Fleming, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Sibdon Carwood-with-Halford.

Bourne, Rev, Percy William Nathaniel, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Doncaster.

Bright, Rev. Edward Augustus, B.A., Vicar of Narborough-with-Narford, Norfolk.

Carter, Rev. Francis John Charsley, B.A., Rector of Beeston St. Andrew, Norfolk.

Copeland, Rev. G. D., B.D., Rector of West Rainton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Durham.

Darnell, Rev. Alfred, Perpetual Curate of Pencoys; Vicar of St. Teath.

Ehlvers, Rev. Frederick, Rector of Holy Trinity with St. Peter's, Shaftesbury.

Gott, Rev. John, D.D., Vicar of Leeds; Dean of Worcester.

Greenwood, Rev. Harry, Rector of Little Steeping.

Huyshe, Rev. Francis John, Vicar of Wimborne Minster; Rural Dean of Pimperne (Wimborne Portion).

Laycock, Rev. G. T., Organising Secretary of the Rochester Diocesan Branch of the Church of England Temperance Society.

Leadbitter, Rev. William Oram, B.A., Curate of St. Mark's, Peterborough; Vicar of Denford-cum-Ringstead.

Mathews, Rev. W. A., Vicar of St. Lawrence's, Appleby; Honorary Canon of Carlisle Cathedral.

Moor, Rev. G. H., M.A., Vicar of Lyminster.

Owen, Rev. J. S., Vicar of St. Mary's, Birmingham; Vicar of St. Alkmund's, Derby.

Richards, Rev. Isaac, M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Truro; Incumbent of St. Mark's, Remnera, Auckland, New Zealand, on the nomination of the Rev. A. R. Tomlinson, on behalf of the nominators of St. Mark's, Remnera.

Rideout, Rev. G. A., M.A., Rector of Rusper.

Rogers, Rev. James John Warrington, M.A., Viear of Aspall, Suffolk.

Shelton, Rev. Norman Wilfrid, Curate of St. Mary's, Barnsley; Minor Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.

Stockdale, Rev. Jeremiah, M.A., Vicar of Baslow, near Chatsworth; Rural Dean of Eyam.

Sturton, Rev. J., Rector of Woodborough; Rural Dean of the Cannings Division of the Avebury Deanery, Diocese of Salisbury.

Tait, Rev. Thomas Henry, M.A., Prebendary of Netherhaven in Salisbury Cathedral.

Turner, Rev. W. H., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Christchurch, Sutton.; Rector of Sutton, Surrey.

Vaughan, Rev. Daniel Rechab, Curate of Helston; Perpetual Curate of Par.

Walmisley, Rev. Horatio, M.A., Vicar of Iffley, Oxon.

Wilkinson. Rev. A. F. L., B.C.L., Curate of Settrington, near Malton; Vicar of East Drayton and Rector of Stokeham, near East Retford.

Wilkinson, Rev. Joseph, Vicar of Brimscombe; Rector of St. Michael's, Bristol.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Burd, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Oxon, Vicar of Cleeton St. Mary, Shropshire, at the Vicarage, Albrighton, on the 12th inst., aged 58.

Clarke, Rev. Adam, Rector of Longton, at 20, Carlton Hill, on the 16th inst., aged 52.

Griffith, Rev. Charles, M.A., Prebendary of St. David's, late Rector of Talachddu, and J.P. for the county of Brecknockshire, at Glyn-Celyn, Brecon, on the 11th inst., aged 81.

Kay, Rev. William, D.D., Rector, late Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, Hon. Canon of St. Albans, at Great Leghs Rectory, Chelmsford, on the 16th inst., aged 65.

Phayre, Rev. Richard, for fifty-four years Rector of East and West Raynham, at West Raynham Rectory, on the 1st inst., aged 78.

Robinson, Rev. John, M.A., of Settle, at Rosebank, Sidmouth, on the 11th inst.

Ross, Rev. William Bathgate, B.A., for thirty years Curate and Rector of Alderney, at St. Anne's Rectory, Alderney, Channel Islands, on the 2nd inst.

Rowe, Ven. William, late Archdeacon of Cornwall, Jamaica, at Funchal, Madeira, on the 31st December, 1885, aged 72.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE NAME "CHRISTIAN."

By the late Very Rev. JAMES HOWIE, M.A., Dean of Cloyne.

Sermon Preached at Cloyne Cathedral.

"And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch."—Acts xi. 26.

IT may, at first sight, appear extraordinary that the name by which the followers of the Lord Jesus are now universally designated to distinguish them from Jews, Mohammedans, and the mass of heathen, should so seldom be found on the pages of the New Testament writings. Throughout the entire of these writings the word "Christian" occurs but three times:—

Firstly. As you have already heard it in the text;

Secondly. In Acts xxvi. 28, where Agrippa says to St. Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian;" and,

Thirdly. Where St. Peter says (1 St. Peter iv. 16), "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed."

Many persons suppose that this name was habitually used by the early disciples themselves; but this is quite a mistake.

The primitive believers uniformly called themselves, and addressed each other, as "the brethren," "the saints," "the elect;" the last especially, because they claimed to have succeeded the Jews in their position as the elect or chosen people of Jehovah.

The real reason why the early disciples got the name of Christians is to be found in certain special circumstances connected with this very Church of Antioch referred to in the text. These special circumstances are not only well worthy of our notice, but, as I hope to show you presently, they tend to suggest some very profitable lessons which may be applied to our own state and circumstances even now. Accordingly, if you carefully read the narrative given us in this 11th chapter of the Acts, you will see that Antioch was the first place at which the two classes of early converts, Jew and Gentile, were formed into one united body of believers.

The 19th verse tells us, that the Evangelists who had been scattered abroad after the death of Stephen, had been preaching the Word "to none but unto the Jews only." On looking, however, at the following verse, we further find that some of them, no doubt encouraged by the revelation to St. Peter respecting Cornelius, boldly followed his example, and on their arrival at Antioch "spake unto the Grecians," *i.e.*, the unconverted Gentiles, and that "a great number" of these latter "believed, and turned unto the Lord." Thus Antioch was the very first place in which it is recorded that Jews and Gentiles were united in one believing body; and, such being the case, some one name was requisite to designate the society so composed. But the name selected needs must have been one, not only unobjectionable to both classes, but expressive of their common belief that Jesus was the promised Messiah of the Prophets—*aliis verbis*, the Christ. Accordingly, we readily discern in these special circumstances of the particular Church we are speaking of, the real reason why the "disciples were called Christians first in Antioch."

But there is another circumstance, which, though not exclusively connected with this Church at Antioch, will materially tend to elucidate the subject before us, and must not therefore be omitted here.

You are all, I am sure, aware that the sharpest and most engrossing controversy which occupied the disciples' minds in the very early days we are now speaking of arose out of the erroneous notion that, even after the admission of the Gentile convert to the fold of Christ, the Jew was still entitled to higher privileges and to be regarded as somehow more the elect, or chosen of God, than his less favoured Gentile brother. Anyone who studies the Epistles of St. Paul must observe the multitude of instances in which his language is studiously framed in opposition to this very error. We find him continually dwelling on the oneness of Faith and perfect equality of privileges which characterised the Gospel dispensation, asserting that all are one in Christ; that in this respect "there is neither Jew nor Greek;" but, if they were in Christ, then were they "Abraham's seed," "Heirs according to the promise."

True, that all-engrossing controversy has long since passed away, and, perhaps, we of the present day can hardly realise the intensity of angry feeling which it then produced amongst the disciples at large. We know, however, that in almost every age, there has been some point, and often a very unimportant one, which specially agitated the Church at that particular time. Thus in the second century there was a fierce controversy as to the precise day on which the festival of Easter should be celebrated; again, as to whether leavened or unleavened bread should be used at the Holy Communion; and, later still, as to the colour of the vestments to be worn by the officiating minister.

We stand amazed that such unimportant matters should ever have been permitted to break the bonds of charity, and to mar the seamless robe of Christ. But when we read the incident recorded

in the text, we are prone to estimate too lightly the noble example of an opposite character there exhibited to us. Thus, I fear, we are led to overlook the important lessons of enlargement of thought, of liberality of sentiment, and of mutual forbearance, which the conduct of this first united society of Christian disciples at Antioch is so eminently calculated to teach ourselves.

We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the very mutual acceptance of the name of Christian implied that both classes there must have consented to merge many minor differences, to give up many deeply-rooted prejudices, and many dearly-cherished hopes. For, supposing the convert to be a Jew, was it no trial or test of deep sincerity to relinquish all his cherished hopes of national superiority, and to accept the hitherto despised Nazarene as his promised Messiah? Supposing him to be a Gentile, was it nothing that the doctrines taught in his boasted Schools of Philosophy, should be trampled in the dust, and that he should acknowledge a recently crucified malefactor as his Lord and God? In short, we have in the conduct of those whose circumstances we are considering a notable illustration of the Apostle's words that, although "Christ crucified" was "unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness," yet to the "called"—those influenced by the true spirit of the Gospel—"Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

But just as the special circumstances we have been considering imply a large exercise of most commendable qualities on the part of that united society of believers which first bore the Christian name, so, our bearing the same name now is by no means to be regarded as a mere empty privilege, but as a vital principle influencing our hearts and lives.

I wish, therefore, to invite your attention to a very few points which seem essential to the spiritually healthful condition of every community which professes the Name of Christ.

Now a very eminent writer has remarked, that there are three main features by which God chose to distinguish His New Gospel Dispensation when He saw fit, in the fulness of time, to put an end to His previous Jewish Dispensation by the actual coming of the promised Messiah, or Christ.

These features consist in the spirituality, the universality, and the unity of the Gospel Kingdom, but our time would not permit me at present to do more than glance at the two first of these. As to its spirituality, you all know that God's first dispensation or kingdom was essentially a kingdom of this world. Jehovah was not only the God, but the temporal Ruler of the Israelite, and obedience was strictly enforced by temporal rewards and penalties.

Under the Gospel Dispensation, however, the very reverse is the case. The rewards are spiritual—not temporal—rewards; not of this world, but of the next. And so far from there being any promised earthly recompense, Jesus forewarns His followers to prepare for trials and persecutions. But in return, He distinctly intimates that there are other sorts of rewards prepared in His Father's House, where the great Forerunner Himself will be ready to receive and welcome those who may have served Him here in spirit and in truth.

As to the Gospel feature of universality, again God's first dispensation was essentially a limited one, in respect of persons, time, and place. It was designed for but one people, and was to last only until the establishment of His new kingdom had superseded the place where He had chosen to put His Name. On the other hand, the emphatic language of Jesus is, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," and "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

With respect to the third feature of unity, which is more immediately connected with the special circumstances of the Church at Antioch, this Christian unity is, no doubt, repeatedly impressed by the New Testament writers; but, somehow, the passages in which it occurs, are frequently misunderstood or misinterpreted, and, therefore, as a sequel, it seems very important that we should clearly ascertain in what real Christian unity consists.

Now, the universal Church of Christ, or, as we call it in our Prayer Book, the "Holy Catholic Church," although one with respect to its Supreme Head in heaven, is no more one community upon earth than the human race, which is one in respect of its divine Creator, was intended to consist of one family, of one political State, under some one prescribed form of government. Real Christian unity rests on the foundation that all who acknowledge Jesus as the Christ are not only admissible through Him to Christian privileges, but all of them to equal privileges alike. When we examine the Jewish Dispensation we find that there were various gradations of privileges. Thus, proselytes were of two classes. Of born Israelites themselves, the tribe of Levi was more specially dedicated to the Lord, and even of that tribe the family of Aaron was alone admitted to the priesthood. Under the Gospel, however, no such gradations exist. All alike, so far as privileges are concerned, are one in Christ, and we pray that there may be "one fold under one Shepherd." Of course, various office-bearers are appointed in the Christian community because no society could exist without them. But all, of whatever race or family, are eligible, and if properly qualified, are admissible to these offices. How misleading then is the expression sometimes used respecting a man about to be ordained, "that he is going to enter into the Church." Correctly speaking, he is in the

Church already, and the meanest baptised Christian is just as much a member of Christ's Church as the most exalted prelate in the land. Unhappily, however, in all ages there has been a tendency to narrow the terms of Communion, and even in the very same community, to draw unwarranted distinctions between ordinary Christians and persons to whom the title of "the Elect" is sometimes most erroneously confined. The Apostles, however, knew no such distinction. They uniformly address all their converts without exception as "the Elect" or chosen of God, and as such entitled to equal privileges alike. But at the same time they exhort them in the most earnest language to walk worthy of these privileges, to make their calling and election sure, and to beware of the terrible alternative which the neglect or abuse of them will assuredly entail.

Upon the whole then, I think we may perceive that real Christian unity consists, not in mere uniformity of worship, or in exact similarity of rites and ceremonies, but in the grand principle of being entitled to equal privileges in Christ, and each man, according to the profitable use he makes of these may, with God's help, improve them to his spiritual advancement and growth in grace; no more being expected of him, and no less accepted, than what unerring justice and equity require. On the other hand again, the mere possession of privileges cannot save. How many who were privileged to witness the marvels of the Red Sea, and to drink of the spiritual rock, nevertheless failed to enter into the Promised Land. And no less is it a priceless privilege now to have been admitted into the number of Christ's elect, to have the offer of His asked-for Spirit to support our tottering steps. But these very privileges, being addressed to beings gifted with freewill and choice, if they do not effect their intended purpose of a blessing, must needs become a curse. An obstinately rejected Gospel is a savour of death unto death, a vitally accepted one, a savour of life unto life.

In proportion then, as sentiments of real Christian unity prevail, they will tend to enlarge our views in respect of our brethren in Christ, inspiring us to hold out the right hand of fellowship to those who, though they differ from us, may yet, with all the fullness of conviction, "love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity" as much as we. When Polycarp, the Bishop of Smyrna, went up to Anicetus on the subject of that Eastern controversy I have already alluded to, it is pleasing to be able to mention that although these two good men came to no agreement on the point in question, they yet parted with that noble sentiment, "Let us then agree to differ." And if professing Christians had in all ages been more disposed to follow their bright example, and the example of the first Christians at Antioch, the bosom of the Church would have been infinitely less torn than it has been with minor unimportant differences. I do not, of course, mean that we should surrender what we consider fundamental matters of faith or practice, for this would be synonymous with a sacrifice of conscience. But, inasmuch as it never was intended that the Universal Church of Christ should consist of only one community upon earth, it seems to follow that minor differences are inseparable from the very imperfection of human nature.

Accordingly, although each separate Christian community is bound to be guided on fundamental points of doctrine by what is contained in, or may be proved by, Holy Scripture, she is yet at full liberty to regulate her forms and such-like matters of discipline as may best suit her own peculiar circumstances, time, and place. This very liberty of action is distinctly asserted in our own 34th Article, which tells us that "It is not necessary that ceremonies should, in all places be utterly alike, but that each Church may change or abolish them, so that all be done towards edifying." And such was the very principle which guided those great reformers of former days, when they undertook the framing of our Liturgy. They did not see fit to frame afresh new forms for themselves, but taking up the forms which antiquity had handed down to them; these they compared with Holy Scripture, freely rejecting such as did not stand that test, and thankfully retaining such as contained the rich and precious ore. And if each Christian community was to act on the same principle, if each was to take up a higher standpoint, so as to enlarge its sphere of vision, the Church of Christ might again come nearer to that happy description given of her earliest days: "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul" (Acts iv. 32), "and breaking bread from house to house did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart" (Acts ii. 46).

True, it is a most pleasing feature of the present day that the elastic bands of mutual toleration which now exist, are far more in accordance with the spirit of the age and with the general sentiments of professing Christians at large than the tightly closed iron fetters of former years would be. Thus, we cannot but rejoice to see, when we take up missionary reports of the present day, that minor differences are not now permitted to mar true Christian unity, or to prevent believers from offering up their united orisons to God. We nowhere find that in foreign lands our brethren of the Scottish Church either decline or are excluded from taking part in our public services. And as to our sister Episcopal Church of America, every one knows she publicly states in the Preface of her own Prayer Book "that she is indebted to our British Church for a long continuance of nursing care;" and should we be warranted to break this sacred bond of unity because she has

chosen, in the exercise of her unfettered liberty, to make certain non-essential alterations in her ritual, which we have not seen fit to adopt?

Accordingly, to ascribe undue importance to non-essentials, or sever the bonds of unity on their account, is somewhat like asserting that we consider the stability of God's temple to consist, not in the solidity of its moral mason-work, but in the gilded ornaments attached to it. And then again, in another view, we may be sure that the more ready we ourselves are to acknowledge in others full freedom of action in all such-like details, and to accord to them full sincerity for thinking their own mode of regulating them the best, the more will such conduct on our part tend to produce similar feelings on their part towards ourselves; because they will be thereby led to honour and respect that firm adherence to our own Prayer Book which we, who love it in its entirety, are proud to exhibit. We do not, of course, attach any superstitious value to the precise phraseology or arrangement of that Book; but those to whom it has been all along endeared would have been as sorry to see material changes made in it, as the possessor of some old hereditary mansion would grieve to witness alterations in the venerable structure of his house, merely to gratify the whim of some modern, fluctuating fashion. Great reason, therefore, have we to be thankful that it has escaped, in recent years, the attempted changes of injudicious hands, and that it has come down to us to-day comparatively scathless and unchanged. In any case, our own obvious duty, as professing members of our Church, is this: to show our real estimation of it by statedly and habitually availing ourselves of its appointed ordinances; and by doing whatsoever in us lies to pass it on, with unmarred visage, to those who shall come after us.

In conclusion, I may well apply to it the eloquent words with which Judge Blackstone winds up his Commentary on the British Constitution:—"Its protection is a duty we owe to ourselves who enjoy it, to those ancestors who have transmitted it to us, and to that posterity who shall claim at our hands this best birthright and noblest inheritance we possess."

## THE BELOVED PHYSICIAN.

By the Rev. JAMES A. CARR, LL.D., Vicar of Whitechurch, Co. Dublin.

Sermon Preached at Whitechurch, on St. Luke's Day, 1885.

"Only Luke is with me."—2 Tim. iv. 11.

THESE words give us a picture of great loneliness; they also present us with a picture of great attachment and affection. St. Paul was writing from his prison-house in Rome. He had been twice in prison, and this was the second time. Every hour he was expecting to be brought before Cæsar, and then condemned to death. As we do know, the end came very speedily after this. The aged Apostle, worn out with grief and labour, was led before the Emperor, put on his trial, pronounced guilty, brought outside the walls of the city, and executed as an enemy of the peace, and a traitor to his country. It was while he was thus waiting for the end, that this second Epistle to Timothy was written. As the marginal note at the end of the Epistle informs us, with every appearance of historical accuracy, it was "written from Rome, when Paul was brought before Nero the second time." A letter written, as it were, on a death-bed! Brethren, the hour will come when we must all lie down for the last time on our beds; we shall probably have made sundry efforts to rise up and fight against the disease that is all too-surely preying on our vitals; but at length it will get too strong for us; Nature, wearied out with the long struggle, will give way, and we shall have to yield ourselves up to the inevitable, and lie down to rise up no more. What will our thoughts be then, of what kind will be the retrospect of our lives? Shall we be able to think of a well-spent life; a life in which the thought of God occupied a prominent part? Will it be in our power then to remember deeds of kindness and consideration done to our fellow-creatures, known perhaps only to ourselves, our God, and the objects of our consideration? Shall we be able to remember systematic acts of benevolence and self-denial, beginning with our duty to God, and that we gave back a fair proportion of what we had received at the hands of His gracious bounty? These are the things which will make our death-bed smooth and easy for us, as we prepare ourselves for our last sleep, and lie down to die with sweet memories, trusting in the mercy of God, through Jesus Christ.

The religious actions of the just
Smell sweet in death, and blossom in the dust.

Look for a moment at the retrospect of his life taken by the Apostle under the circumstances I have mentioned, in the immediate prospect of a cruel and undeserved death. Are there vain regrets and bitter repinings at his hard lot? Nay, but the most perfect acquiescence with the will of God, a most beautiful resignation, as he takes a calm and happy glance backwards over his past life. "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me in that day, and not to me only, but to all them also that love His appearing."

Still the Apostle was human, and the sense of his loneliness oppressed him at times. Religion

does not blunt the edge of natural affections. Love for God does not shut out or crush down the love of our kith and kin. The conviction that his end is coming very near to him does not interfere with his desire to have his friends about him. He also feels the bitter cold of his prison-house; the damp and searching winds from the Tiber reach him in his cell, and so he asks for his cloak that he had forgotten at Troas: and, to wile away the long and dreary hours of his captivity, he asks for his "books," and "especially the parchments," on which probably he had been in the habit of writing his letters to the various Churches. But, above every thing else, he craves the presence of his friends. He writes to his son Timothy, "Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me;" he would look once more with fond love into the face of him whom he had begotten in the faith. Demas had forsaken him, this present world having too great an attraction for him, Crescens had gone to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia. Mark was not with him, Tychicus he had sent to Ephesus, Erastus was at Corinth, and he had left Trophimus sick at Miletum. Again he presses on Timothy to do his diligence to come to him before the winter, and he sums up his condition of loneliness in these words, "only Luke is with me."

But although the Apostle had only Luke with him, still *he* was, as we would say, "a host in himself." First of all, he was "the beloved physician," and the Apostle, no doubt, had often times experienced his skill. Then he was a man of like disposition with himself. He loved the same Lord and Master, and had faithfully served Him. Like the Apostle, too, he was highly educated, and apparently well trained in the literature of the times. If tradition speaks truly, he added the profession of a painter to that of a physician. He was an author,* and his two contributions to the books of the New Testament, his Gospel, and his history of the founding of the Christian Church, known as the "Acts of the Apostles," present the most classical and perfect Greek to be found in the New Testament.

The words "only Luke is with me" show how closely and constantly he had kept to the Apostle while others had left him. No doubt he had often times been to St. Paul what his name signified, a ray of light in the darkness of his subterranean prison. When he opened the door of his cell, and was allowed in to see the Apostle, it was as though a cheerful ray of light came into the dark dungeon, and we must believe that, like a wise and good physician, he had cheery words and pleasant looks for his old friend and fellow-labourer in the cause of Christ. That these two men loved and valued one another is plain from their whole history. From the moment that St. Luke joined himself to St. Paul, as we read in the 16th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, he seems to have left him, if at all, only for a short season at a time; and here we find him close by his side when the Apostle is nearly at the end of his life-journey.

Now in the case of St. Paul there seems to have been a particular reason why he should have

* "The use of technical phraseology is traceable in his mention of the 'fevers (the word is plural in the Greek) and dysentery,' of which Publius was healed at Melita (Acts xxviii. 8), 'in the feet' (not the common πόδες, but the more precise βάσεις) 'and ankle bones' of Acts iii. 7; in the 'scales' that fell from St. Paul's eyes (Acts ix. 18); in the 'trance,' or more literally, *ecstasy*, connected with St. Peter's vision (Acts x. 9, 10) as brought on by the Apostle's exposure to the noontide sun after long-continued fasting; in the special adjective used for 'eaten of worms' in Acts xii. 23; in his notice of the 'virtue' or healing power that flowed forth from our Lord's body (Luke viii. 46); and of the sweat in 'clots' or drops like as of blood that issued from it in the Agony of Gethsemane (Luke xxii. 44).

"It is noticeable in tracing the connection of St. Paul and St. Luke, that on each occasion when the one joins the other for a time, it is after the Apostle had suffered in a more than common degree from the bodily infirmities that oppressed him. When they met at Troas, it was after he had been detained in Galatia by 'the infirmity of his flesh' (Gal. iv. 13). When the one joins the other in the voyage to Jerusalem, it is after St. Paul had 'the sentence of death' in himself, had been 'dying daily,' had been 'delivered from so great a death,' had been carrying about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus (2 Cor. i. 9; iv. 10—12. 16). From that time St. Luke seems scarcely to have left his friend, except, perhaps, for short intervals; and the way in which St. Paul speaks of him as 'the beloved physician,' makes it almost a matter of certainty that it was by his ministrations as a physician that he had made himself 'beloved.' The constant companionship of one with St. Luke's knowledge and special culture was sure sooner or later to affect St. Paul's thoughts and language, and traces of this influence are to be found in many of the Epistles. Most of these are naturally more manifest in the Greek than in the English words; but we may note as examples, the frequent use of the ideal of 'health' as the standard of life and teaching as seen in the phrases 'sound,' or better *healthy*, 'doctrine' (ὑγιαινούσῃ) of 1 Tim. i. 10, vi. 3, 2 Tim. i. 13; and in the 'doting' or better, *diseased* of 1 Tim. vi. 4; in the spread of error being like that of a gangrene or cancer (2 Tim. ii. 17); in the word for 'puffed up,' which implies the delirium of a fever of the typhus type (τυφωθείς) in 1 Tim. iii. 6, vi. 4, 2 Tim. iii. 4; in the conscience seared, or better, *cauterised*, till it has become callous (1 Tim. iv. 2); in the malady of 'itching ears' (2 Tim. iv. 3); in the 'bodily exercise' or training (literally the training of the gymnasium) that profiteth little (1 Tim. iv. 8); in the precept which enjoined on Timothy, as a means of keeping his mind in a state of equilibrium and purity, uncontaminated by the evil with which his office brought him into contact; to 'drink no longer water' only, but 'to use a little wine for his stomach's sake and his often infirmities' (1 Tim. v. 23); in the judgment that a reckless disregard of the body is of no value as a remedy against what is technically called *fulness* (not 'satisfying') of the flesh (Col. ii. 23). These words are in almost all cases characteristic of the Greek of Hippocrates and other medical writers, and the same may be said of the Greek words used by St. Paul for 'dung' (σκύβαλα, Phil. iii. 8), for 'occasion' (ἀφορμή, 1 Tim. v. 14), for 'gazing' or 'looking earnestly' (ἀτενιζῶν, 2 Cor. iii. 7—13: the word is used twelve times by St. Luke, and by him only), for 'charge' (1 Tim. i. 3, 18), for 'contention' (*i.e.*, *paroxysm*) in Acts xv. 39"—"Dr. Plumptre's Introduction to Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel." *Ellicott's New Testament Commentary for English Readers* (pp. 238, 239).

attached to himself a man of St. Luke's profession. As we know from his own writings, the Apostle was subject to some kind of painful disorder, which seized him at times, and rendered him almost helpless. What more natural then, under the circumstances, than this constant presence with him of "the beloved physician"? For the sake of being near him, and able to minister to him when he required his skill, St. Luke was ready to share in all the afflictions and dangers of the Apostle. He counted the cost; and although he knew that to keep company with St. Paul, and thus identify himself with him, exposed him to the danger of being likewise imprisoned and charged with treason against Cæsar, and perhaps run the risk of losing his life, he braved all the consequences for the sake of being near his beloved friend, able to minister to him in his afflictions, and alleviate his sufferings when those dreadful attacks came on him. It was thus, then, that St. Paul wrote these words to Timothy—"Only Luke is with me."

This constancy of St. Luke is brought out in this passage all the more strongly in contrast with the absence of others. For one reason or another the Apostle had been left all but alone. Indeed, at one moment he seems to have been absolutely so. Perhaps his companions had wearied of his long captivity, perhaps they were in fear for their own lives, or perhaps, let us hope, some of them had gone on missionary journeys. Of one at least we know that the world had got too strong a hold upon him. He could no longer withstand its attractions. He was wearied of the demands made upon him by the Cross of Christ. In the Epistle to the Colossians, when St. Paul was undergoing his first imprisonment "Luke" and "Demas" were certainly with him, for he writes: "Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas greet you;" but by the time of his second imprisonment Demas had grown tired of his discipleship, he had gone back from Christ, and walked no more with him: "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica."

Look in and see Christ's chosen saint,
In triumph wear his Christ-like chain;
No fear lest he should swerve or faint,
His life is Christ, his death is gain.
Two converts, watching by his side,
Alike his love and greetings share;
* * * * * * *
Pass a few years—look in once more,
The saint is in his bonds again;
Save that his hopes more boldly soar,
He and his lot unchanged remain.
But only Luke is with him now.

True and sterling Friendship is a blessing for which to thank God; but when that friendship is cemented in the bonds of Christian love and fellowship, there is still more for which to be thankful. Perhaps the friendship of a skilled and Christian physician is one of the greatest blessings for which we can thank God, a man who can not only minister to the wants of the poor sick frame, but can also strengthen our faith in the unseen. I know nothing more calculated to uphold the Christian faith within a man's soul than to find in his physician a calm trust not only in his own skill and experience, the growth of patient study during a course of years, but also calm trust in God, and a firm grasp of the eternal verities of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Thank God that such is the case not unfrequently, and that the men who walk the wards of our hospitals, and are hourly brought in contact with the solemnities of death, are also men who are walking with God in the calm assurance of faith. Such, for example, was one whose name I may be allowed to mention here—the late Benjamin George McDowell.

In this connection it may not be out of place to recal the name of another noble physician, still happily among us, Dr. E. C. Thompson, who recently jeoparded his life to save that of a child suffering from diphtheretic poisoning, and who has received from his Sovereign a gracious recognition of his heroism—a heroism as great as any that ever led a soldier on the field of battle to face the deadly breach. Such men may fairly claim to be successors in a long and peerless line, at the head of which stands the name of Luke, physician, evangelist, and confessor. The same steadfastness of purpose, the same loyalty to duty, the same unfaltering courage characterised "the beloved physician," and made the Apostle in those few words testify to the unshaken attachment and keen devotion of his faithful friend, skilled adviser, and fellow-Christian, "Only Luke is with me."

---

CANON PAGET, D.D., Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, Oxford, is to preach the sermon at the consecration of Lord Alwyne Compton, Bishop-Elect of Ely, at St. Paul's, on Tuesday. We are requested to state that if members of the Southern Convocation who have received tickets will assemble in the Chapter-house at a quarter before eleven punctually they can robe there, and join in the procession, and they will find special places reserved for them in the choir. Notice of their intention should at once be sent to Archdeacon Sumner at the Close, Winchester.

SIR F. A. GORE OUSELEY, Mus.D., has been appointed Canon Residentiary of Hereford Cathedral in the room of the late Dr. Jebb. Sir Frederick graduated from Christ Church in 1846, and was ordained in 1849. In 1855 he was appointed Professor of Music in his University and Precentor of Hereford, and in the following year Warden of St. Michael's College, and vicar of St. Michael's, near Tenbury. He was elected Proctor for the Chapter in 1868. He is a well-known composer of services and anthems as well as of oratorios St. "Polycarp" and "Hagar," of treatises on harmony, and other works.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 30, 1886.

## LAY REPRESENTATION IN THE CHURCH.

EVERY reformer is in favour of giving the laity in parishes, in dioceses, and in provinces, some larger share in the government of the Church. The Archbishop of Canterbury is in favour of the plan of adding to the existing and legally constituted Houses of Convocation a consultative House of Laymen: and it cannot be denied that it is intended to meet a real need, and to strengthen a weak point in the organisation of the Church. He believes—and the opinion will surprise all who are acquainted with the real facts—that a sufficient representation of the laity is actually in course of formation by the Diocesan Conferences under clerical influence. But the thing is being done in a corner, and the body that is being brought into existence is only a nominal, and not a real representation of that great multitude of Christians who worship in the parish churches of England. A body thus formed is sure to be treated with contempt and neglect by the clergy, the parliament, and the people. Certainly a body thus constituted can never exercise any real power and influence. The Archbishop of York, in his reply to the Cambridge memorialists, takes a much more sober and practical view of securing lay representation in Church Councils. He says:—

> The difficulty of dealing with lay representation is, perhaps, greater than some might suppose; my experience is that laymen would not give their time and support as part of any council in which there was no substantial work done and no substantial power exercised. An attempt to graft a lay element upon the two Convocations might do good; but it would not be enough to satisfy reasonable demands. And yet the Convocations must continue to be, so far as I see, the legislative body of the Church of England. The problem therefore is to find sufficient inducement to the laity to take part in the proceedings of a body which would not be the legal representative body of the Church of England, and which would have no power to enforce any decree or carry forward any change.

Unless the elected laymen are to be members of the legal representative body of the Church of England, it would be a sheer waste of time and a farce to elect them. It would be better for the Crown to nominate a certain number of laymen to sit as Members of Convocation. But if the reform we advocate in the ancient constitution of our Church be adopted, viz., by giving increased power, influence and authority to the churchwardens with the appointment of lay archdeacons and lay rural deans as inspectors, there would be two legally constituted lay representatives in every parish well versed in Church matters and Church needs, and we see no valid objection why these churchwardens should not elect lay proctors for Convocation just as the clergy do. In the same way we hold that the moral and spiritual work of the Church would be improved and enhanced by increasing the power and influence of the churchwardens, so would the legislative work of Convocation be improved by an infusion of lay proctors selected by the churchwardens. There are no objections, but, on the contrary, many and great advantages, as we think, why the laical and clerical representatives of the Church should sit and debate together in Convocation. Free exchange of ideas between the two classes would be advantageous alike to themselves and to the best interests of the Church. Archbishop Benson fears that the admission of lay representatives would "impair the ancient constitutional privilege and independence of Convocation as it stands now." We have great hope that it would vastly strengthen them; certainly both the privilege and the independence are at present very insecure, considering that until a few years since they were entirely suppressed during 140 years. Unlike the previous reforms we have suggested in our Church system, this one for lay representation would require an Act of Parliament, as would any other system of lay representation worthy of the name. This is a drawback, but the plan would form a good practical and working House of Laymen, not of members who would tend to be one-sided enthusiasts or to become more or less indifferent, but of real *bonâ fide* representatives of all classes and of all parties in the Church.

## A LESSON FROM HISTORY.

PERHAPS no prophet ever spoke more plainly than, at the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah spoke to the people who flocked in from the country to Jerusalem to the temple services. But the times were such that plain speaking was needed. Josiah was dead, killed in battle, and with him died the last of the good kings; with him too perished all hope of averting the ruin of the Jewish nation. For Jehoiakim wholly reversed his father's policy; even if he did not actually restore the worship of idols, at least he connived at it. He was both an irreligious and an immoral man; and therefore, just as his father's reformation had made the worship of Jehovah fashionable, but nothing more than fashionable,

so now the son's idolatrous and immoral habits very quickly made the worship of Baal in the high places fashionable instead.

To such a state had the nation sunk, that there was hardly any real religion at all in the land,—there was plenty of ritualistic worship, either of Jehovah or Baal according as the fashion might be; but nothing more. Josiah (personally a good man) had indeed done all that a good king could; he had restored the temple, he had abolished the idols, he had reformed the court, he had at any rate religiously worshipped Jehovah himself. And of course the nobility had outwardly followed in his train, the worship of Jehovah became fashionable, a good thick coating of paint was spread over the customs of society; hiding away its evils from view, and because Jehovah seemed to be worshipped, the common people were deceived into thinking that all was well.

It was Jeremiah's mission to tell the people that all was not well, that Josiah's reformation was but as an outward varnish, and that the nation was as far, and even farther from true religion than ever.

Therefore, by the command of God, he takes his stand at the gate of the temple; and addresses to the people words of solemn warning:—"Hear the word of the Lord, all ye of Judah, that enter in at these gates to worship the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: Amend your ways and your doings, and I will cause you to dwell in this place. Trust ye not in lying words saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these. For if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings, if ye thoroughly execute judgment between man and his neighbour, if ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your hurt, then will I cause you to dwell in this place."

In vain, Jeremiah tells them, do they trust in Josiah's splendid restoration of the temple's services so long as heathen abominations exist within it: "Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal," he says, "and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and come and stand before Me in this house, which is called by My name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations." In vain, he tells them again, do they trust in any outward reformation of worship, which, without reformation of heart, is but hypocrisy and sham. "Trust ye not," he says, "in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these buildings." To restore the outward form of worship without the restoration of inward religion is but to offer an oblation which is vain, and incense which is an abomination. God will not accept the show of religion for the reality, He will reject both it and its offerer, but—"if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings, if ye thoroughly execute judgment between a man and his neighbour, if ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless and the widow, and shed not innocent blood, neither walk after other gods; then, saith Jehovah, will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land which I gave to your fathers for ever and ever."

Does not such a state of things as this very greatly resemble our own times? Jeremiah did not accuse his countrymen of open neglect of the ordinances of religion, nor could any such accusation be brought against us. He had himself seen what would now-a-days be called a great religious revival, and he had also seen the worthlessness of it all. It was only a question of fashion—just as it is often very little else but a question of fashion now. Our age has seen some wonderful changes in fashion. Fifty years ago we had what has been called the Catholic revival; ritualism became fashionable, and it almost became the fashion to go over to Rome—in fact a great many did go. Then the pendulum of fashion swung back; Exeter Hall became fashionable; and the last new thing was to go and listen to Dr. Cumming's explanations of the book of the Revelation. Then a curious kind of scientific infidelity became fashionable; Darwin was supposed to have given a far more correct account of creation (supposing his theories allow of any,) than Moses, and Professor Tyndall told the British Association at Belfast that the theories of the heathen poet Lucretius were pretty nearly even if not quite correct. All these things, which our sober, studious, industrious Puritan forefathers would have had far too much sense to listen to, this idle, thoughtless, frivolous, pleasure-loving age duly believed, or tried to—simply following the fashion.

And now it would seem that again the pendulum has swung back, we are getting tired of æsthetics and infidelity, all the more quickly because the latter has produced its inevitable fruit of lawlessness; both private property and Church property have been threatened—people have got frightened and have roused themselves to repel the attack. To some extent the attack has been resisted, at any rate we may say that the results of the elections will prevent any fresh attack being made on the Church during this Parliament, though he must surely be very short-sighted who thinks the Church establishment has gained anything more than a temporary reprieve.

But we have gained as churchmen, five or six years perhaps, or at any rate an interval, which, whether longer or shorter, will be absolutely decisive of our fate one way or another. The fate of the Church establishment will depend exactly upon whether, leaving fashions and frivolities of all kinds, we set ourselves resolutely to obey Jeremiah's words, "amend your ways and your doings," or whether we content ourselves with shows of reformation, and trust in lying words, saying,

"The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these." If things continue as they have been and as they are, if churchmen are content with the name of churchmen, and if we are satisfied with ourselves because we have defended the Church's rights and revenues at the polling booth, if we continue to think it quite sufficient to give to her charities only about one-hundredth part or less of what we squander on our own pleasures, if those who have both the time and the ability persistently refuse to take that part in Church work which they very easily might take if only they would, if we remain the idle, luxurious, pleasure-seeking people we are—if above all we trust in our polished respectability and in our improved services and the restoration of our buildings, saying, "the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these," then our last opportunity will be thrown away, our year of grace during which we may yet bear fruit will remain unused, our candlestick will rightly be taken away, and our fate both as a Church establishment and as a nation will justly be sealed. Schemes for reformation are already multiplying, but it is not outward reforms that are needed, or at any rate they are the least part of our needs; it is not our machinery that is wrong, it is we ourselves who are wrong. At present to be a churchman only means to be one who comes to Church, not to chapel, with more or less regularity. It ought to mean, to be a man who is scrupulously honest and honourable in all his ways, just in all his dealings, truthful in all he says, kind and sympathetic to his neighbour, one respected of all men. It may be much that Churchmen have already done for their Church; in one sense it certainly is much, for it has gained us time. But we have done nothing if we have only gained for ourselves a little more time to continue trusting in lying words, saying: "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these." On our acts, not on our schemes of reform, however excellent these may be, but on our lives and conduct during the next few years, the very existence of our Church as an establishment depends. For Church establishments live only so long as Church members trust in the Lord, and live lives of daily self-denial, daily taking up the cross and daily following Christ.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### THE IRISH QUESTION.

SIR,—Names are highly important things. "The rose by any other name would smell as sweet," says Shakespeare; but even this admits of doubt. The lovely cabbage-rose is greatly injured in reputation by its name. So is the periwinkle, a poetical flower in France, as the *pervenche*. But, to be serious—how much hinges on the correctness of the word "Catholic." How injurious to actual unity is the unhappy expression, "Great Britain *and* Ireland," as if Ireland with its Celtic population were not an essential part of Britain, which was Celtic from the first.

I am amused by the angry declaration of one of your Irish subscribers, that the Irish are not a nation because there are two races in Ireland. *A fortiori*, the English cannot be a nation, for we have ancient Britons, Angles, other Saxons, Danes, and Normans; and ours is the most frequently conquered country in the world, a Dutchman being our last invader. Is it really impossible to get any Irishmen to take a practical view of matters? Your correspondent says mine is an excellent plan on paper, but that "the people here" (in the Irish north) will not have it.

Now, Sir, I must be allowed to reiterate my strong conviction, that the Irish are a nation, and a very noble nation, and that they supply an element of grace, charm, and eloquence, lacking alike to English and to Scotch. Doubtless the Irish have a mournful past. Wrong, oppression, violence, barbarism, superstition, have done their worst; and, of late years, what I believe to be a mistaken economic policy has wrought fearful mischief. But, Sir, it is none the less true that the Irish possess faculties of a high order, which are peculiar to themselves, and of which every Irishman should be proud. Let me enumerate a few. They have strong family affections, which shame our English coldness; a faculty for generous enthusiasm; a keen sense of the beautiful, which might make them the most artistic of peoples; a fervent spirit of devotion, whatever form it may have taken; moral courage to uphold what they believe to be the truth, shown by all Irish speakers and parties in and out of Parliament. Is all this nothing? As for their military ardour, to which we owe no small share of our Imperial victories, it scarcely needs to be insisted on. What, Sir, shall a countryman of Burke, Sheridan, Grattan, Arthur Wellesley, Palmerston, Moore, Goldsmith, and Swift, be unwilling to admit of the existence of Irish genius or an Irish nation?

Now, Sir, what I have proposed is not an Irish Parliament, not separation in any sense, but local chambers sitting for local purposes for two months yearly in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin. What I desire is, that the burden of our excessive centralisation should be diminished. England and Wales are one, and cannot be disunited, in my judgment, even for local purposes of legislation. If we did that, we should have to go back to the days of the Heptarchy, and that is clearly not expedient. But local chambers, twofold in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, would only prepare for the Imperial Parliament, which can alone grant Imperial subsidies.

It is suggested that *all* the Scottish and Irish peers should sit in the Scotch and Irish upper chambers. Can it be doubted that these bodies would be opposed to revolutionary changes? Is what has moved your correspondent's anger the suggestion that in Dublin Roman Catholic and Anglican bishops and representatives of Irish Presbyterianism should sit together in the upper chamber? Religious animosity is a fearful thing in Ireland. An English "broad-Church" clergyman, who believes from his heart in the creeds, may perhaps be permitted to say that he has some strong sympathies both with Roman Catholics and

with Protestants, without incurring furious condemnation.

You know, Sir, for I have often contended in your columns for this truth, that I believe not only in a universal Divine Presence of our Lord and Saviour, but also in a specific sacramental presence, as the Lamb that was slain at every altar, while I utterly reject the change of substance insisted on by Rome. Practically, without trying to define too far, I believe that humanity needs the sense of an Immediate Presence, together with an opportunity for loving homage and ardent intercession. The Irish Anglican Church has been living without this immediate worship for three centuries. It has had and has many graces and blessings, intellectual and spiritual, but to my mind it has tried to live by moonlight and starlight only. The Roman Catholic Church has had the daylight of sacramental worship combined, doubtless, with no small amount of error and corruption. She has also preserved the all but essential truth of prayer for the departed. No doubt this truth had been grievously abused. It was mixed up with paid masses and paid indulgences, with the wonderful notion that the Bishop of Rome had the disposal of the Saints' merits, and the keys of death and hell. No wonder that our Protestant forefathers should have revolted from these excesses! Nevertheless, the heart claims its due. It desires to follow its dear ones to another sphere, and the Church which refuses to gratify the instincts of intercession and adoration can never be *popular*. The English Church has never been, since the Reformation. When the middle state was practically denied, and only hell and heaven were left, the popular instinct was to be certain of ultimate salvation. From the hour of the Reformation forward, the popular instinct was for Calvinism, therefore, to make sure of escaping an endless hell, and for impassioned preaching and prayer, which might paint and so bring home that central truth of Christianity, "Christ crucified," the sacramental embodiment of which was not kept constantly before the eyes and hearts of the people in the showing of our Lord and Master's death.

I do not suppose that my (supposed) reconciliation. of the doctrines of the Churches can have the slightest weight with Irishmen, but I would beseech them to live and let live. The will of Christ the Lord is that His Church and His people should be one; division implies imperfection. There is such a thing as cold and hard Protestantism, and as excessive Popery. Let cultivated, thoughtful men sit and legislate together; they will discover that those whom they suppose their worst adversaries are human as well as themselves.

As for Mr. Giffen's proposal to buy up and buy out the nobility and gentry of the land, I can conceive of nothing more monstrous, nothing more pernicious. It is worthy of a follower of dismal pseudo-science. The Irish are a people who emphatically need aristocratic leaders. What is Mr. Parnell but such an one? We see the practical ruin wrought in France by a foolish democratic levelling. Clever lawyers and political adventurers are no safe masters for any country, though they may contribute their fair share to legislation. There is no continuity possible, no security, no permanent elevation of national sentiment, without an hereditary peerage, which I now propose to develop and secure.

ARCHER GURNEY

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford.

## BUCHANANISMS.

SIR,—The grammar of Mr. Buchanan's last attack on the Irish Church, in your columns, is weak and the logic is still weaker, *e.g.* as regards grammar. "Calling upon a policeman, who was at church, to remove the lady (he was so enraged that he walked out of church, and was not there for several Sundays). Whether the "he" in the above bracket was "*a clergyman who has done acts in his church on a Good Friday*" (sic) or the policeman I cannot make out. This "clergyman, who has done acts in his church," has so annoyed his congregation thereby, that they have ceased subscribing to the Sustentation Fund. Therefore, says Mr. Buchanan, "it behoves the clergy to keep on good terms with their congregations else they stop the supplies."

But a few lines further on he says, "Had this taken place in England, the Press would have been full of it, and the clergyman in question would very soon have been obliged to vacate his parish, but it seems nothing of the kind took place in Ireland, as he is still in possession."

There is a great deal *taken for granted*, in the above sentence, as to what would have happened in England. But Mr. Buchanan having just before stated that the Irish parishoners were trying to starve this man out "(who has done acts in his church)," and thereby oblige him to vacate his parish, now adds, "it seems nothing of the kind took place in Ireland"—no row in the Press, no pressure to make him resign indeed when the *argumentum ad crumenam* was admittedly already in operation! Call you that nothing?

But Mr. Buchanan attacks the Irish Church because "six mansions are vacant" in a particular union of parishes, and says she is rapidly declining in that part of Ireland; it seems also that a clergyman has had a month's bronchitis in the same district, and has been unable to discharge his duty. As regards the six mansions vacant, surely the poor Irish Church is not responsible for their condition. The former occupants no doubt have been robbed of their rents and intimidated by Land Leaguers and driven away; but why cast this in the teeth of the Irish Church?—Why indeed? Well it is only Mr. Buchanan's way. As regards the clergyman with bronchitis, was the Bishop informed of his illness and were no steps taken to provide a substitute?

Even "a relative of mine" (viz. Mr. Buchanan's) does not escape the Irish epidemic of illness or indolence, as "poor young man he is *unable for duty*" (*sic*). How unfortunate are all Mr. Buchanan's Irish experiences! It is well he left Ireland in time or even he might have become fatally blighted by further residence. O, Sir, such stuff as this, however silly it may be, is painful reading for Irish Churchmen, who are really in the midst of a great and terrible crisis, who are doing their duty, many of them, under circumstances of anxiety and danger never experienced by their English brethren. Church work, in the South and West of Ireland, is a work requiring men's best energies. Put down empty mansions and empty churches to the credit, or discredit, of Mr. Gladstone, but do not villify the only faithful witness for God's truth in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, by ascribing to *her* neglect losses distinctly attributable to other causes.

AN IRISH CLERK OF TWENTY YEARS' STANDING.

## THE NEW BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.

SIR—Having been born and bred in Melbourne, allow me, through your columns, to assure Churchmen that Lord Salisbury has appointed the right man to Manchester.

Speculation is rife as to the reasons which led Lord Salisbury to go so far for a good man, but the fact is that one of our ablest, most zealous, and large-minded Bishops has been chosen to do in Manchester what he has done so well in Melbourne. The world is getting smaller, and the Church is being unified—that is all.

Dr. Moorhouse's Sunday afternoon lectures on the Fourth Gospel drew large audiences at an hour when Church workers are in Sunday-schools and the *οἱ πολλοί* of Melbourne are abroad.

His influence over men is quite remarkable. The students of the University of Melbourne, though gathered from all parts of Australia and belonging to all sects, were especially fond of him.

He was the working man's friend, and nothing pleased him better than to grapple with social and economic problems. He will make his mark in the House of Lords. The work done by Bishop Moorhouse in the diocese of Melbourne will live and bear fruit. He worked hard and had much to discourage him, but of all that he did the most strikingly successful work was his raising the educational standard of the clergy.

When the diocese was formed in 1847 men did not go to Australia to take holy orders, they went for gold, and Bishop Perry had to take inferior men for the country districts, but the necessity had passed away in 1876. When Bishop Moorhouse arrived in the latter year he held up his hands in holy horror at the education of the country clergy, and from that day to this he has laboured to get good, well-educated, cultured clergy. It is now very difficult to get an incumbency in the diocese of Melbourne without University training to back you. God grant that this may soon be the case in Manchester! All statements as to his definite views are wrong. If he belongs to any school of thought he is Broad Church. His experience of Nonconformists, &c., has been peculiar; for in the diocese of Melbourne the Roman Catholics are numerically the strongest, and the Presbyterians are the wealthiest.

He will leave Melbourne amid universal regret, and he will not be long in Manchester before his flock will feel that they have a sterling man going before them, and all other denominations will look to him for guidance and counsel.

Manchester is a fortunate diocese.

JAMES MIDDLETON MACDONALD, M.A.,
Curate of Warminster.

## ACTS XIX. 2.

SIR,—In his review of the Archbishop of Canterbury's charge, your reviewer roundly asserts, respecting the disciples of John whom St. Paul met at Ephesus, that these Christians are expressly said never to have even heard of that divine "Person," namely, the Holy Spirit; and because the Archbishop understands the passage differently, he charges him with founding an argument "on a forced interpretation of a Scripture text."

Your reviewer does not seem to be aware that the whole weight of modern critical authority is against his own interpretation; and for his own sake I sincerely hope that he was writing in ignorance. It is perhaps enough to say briefly, that his interpretation is simply an impossible one, because, as the "Speaker's Commentary" says, "of the Holy Ghost all Jews must have heard in the Psalms and in other portions of their Scriptures," and because the outpouring of the Spirit was an essential part of their Messianic hope (see Joel ii. 28). A similar method of interpretation would make St. John assert (vii. 39) that the Spirit did not begin to exist till Jesus was glorified. It may therefore be taken for certain that these disciples of John could not have meant that they knew nothing about the Holy Spirit, and had never even heard of His existence.

But what precisely did they mean? This is an interesting question, and it has been somewhat obscured by the tenses of the verbs being wrongly translated in the A. V. If this version accurately represented the original, the answer would be simple. To St. Paul's question, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" they must have meant to reply that not only had they not received Him themselves, but they had not even heard that He was yet given,—was yet receivable (so to speak)—or that the time for His being given had yet arrived. But when the tenses are correctly rendered, the meaning appears to be somewhat different. In the R. V. we rightly read, so far at least as the tenses are concerned, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed? And they said unto him, Nay, we did not so much as hear whether the Holy Ghost was *given*" (margin, there is a Holy Ghost). It is clear then that both question and answer refer to the specific time of their baptism by John. "Did you at your baptism receive the Spirit?" the apostle virtually asks; and they reply, "No, at our baptism we did not hear anything about the Spirit; we not only did not receive any such gift then, but we did not even hear of any such gift being connected with our baptism. Nothing was said to us at that time about the Spirit."

It will be seen that there is absolutely no ground in the text for your reviewer's *dictum*, that "they are expressly said *never* to have even heard" of the Spirit. He ought to have written, "not to have even heard of the Spirit *at the time of, and in connection with, their baptism*." This agrees with the history, and with St. Paul's own statement that "John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on Him which should come after Him." To repent, and look for the Christ, was the lesson of their baptism; it did not include the doctrine of the Spirit.

Will you pardon me for adding a remonstrance against the sneering tone adopted towards the Primate, in this and several preceding articles in your paper? Bishops and Archbishops are but fallible men, and their opinions and actions can claim no immunity from respectful criticism. But I think it should be remembered by the critics themselves that neither are *they* infallible—no, not even the youngest and most ignorant of them, and that sitting in the seat of the scornful requires more than ordinary qualifications to carry off its offensiveness. There may be some churchmen, I hope not many, who are pleased with hearing the chief ruler in their Church flouted at as "this eminent pedagogue," or as "the æsthetic Benson," or as "only an *homunculus*," or as

'a thorough opportunist,'' or as "going through a mental process which he is pleased to call *thinking out*," or as being as the prophets of old, who were "like foxes in the deserts, and saw vanity and lying divination." There may be some, but I doubt if they include any who are eminent for wisdom and piety, to say nothing of good taste; the majority of those whose opinion is valuable must inevitably be repelled by such ill-scented flowers of rhetoric, which, far from being attractive, warn off the intelligent reader, and make him feel that he may go farther and fare no worse. PRESBYTER.

[We think our respected correspondent is somewhat inaccurate as well as hypercritical; he describes the very words of Scripture as the *dictum* of our reviewer. The words 'Αλλ' οὐδὲ εἰ Πνεῦμα ἅγιόν ἐστιν ἠκούσαμεν are perfectly clear, and mean that the persons were ignorant of the existence of that Divine Person. How this remarkable ignorance is to be accounted for is, no doubt, a difficult question, and quite unanswerable in the case of persons of whose antecedents we know only one particular. But the existence of the difficulty does not authorise us to say that the singular state of mind could not have existed, and therefore to force a different meaning upon plain words.

If "Presbyter's" reading of these words is accurate —and we believe it is—it in no way invalidates the substantial truth of our reviewer's criticism of the Archbishop's *thought out* Creed of the Joanneans. One article of that Creed is belief in, not mere hearsay rumour concerning, the existence of the Holy Ghost. "Presbyter" would seem to rule that historical knowledge of a person is equivalent to belief in and experience of his suggestive, guiding and controlling power; in fact, contrary to the express teaching of Scripture, he would have us believe that these Joanneans were in the same mental and moral condition *before* as *after* their baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus. He would deny that "the Holy Ghost came on them and they spake with tongues and prophesied.'' If "Presbyter" really believes Archbishop Benson's theory, and also in the saving efficacy of ecclesiastical ceremonies, millinery, mitres, croziers, and other make-believe paraphernalia, he does well to be offended at our flouting at them, but we think it would be a waste of time and type to follow his advice and solemnly, seriously, and respectfully criticise even archiepiscopal opinions and actions in such trivial matters. As to our criticisms on Archbishop Benson and others, we do not at all repent of them. The freest remarks are good for the public, and good for the individual who is the subject of them. If he is in fault they correct him; if not, he passes harmless. It is very salutary for a person in a great ecclesiastical position to feel that he will not be exempt from that unsparing criticism which is the lot of all public men. —Ed.]

On Friday, the 23rd inst., a party of clergymen, all of long experience in parochial work, had an interview with the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject of Church reform, and laid before his Grace their strong objection to the proposed Parochial Church Councils with statutory powers. There were present Canons T. T. Carter, Hoste, and Gregory, Archdeacon Randall, the Revs. B. Compton, H. M. Villiers, W. E. Heygate, R. T. West, F. J. Ponsonby, W. C. Ingram, and R. R. Bristow.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Angel-Smith, Rev. R. W. A., Minor Canon of Bristol Cathedral.
Carroll, Rev. George, M.A., Minor Canon of Worcester Cathedral; Rector of St. Martin's, Worcester.
Darby, Ven. John Lionel, M.A., Canon and Archdeacon of Chester; Dean of Chester.
Deakin, Rev. Benjamin, Curate (Sole Charge) of Martin Hussingtree.
Eddowes, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of St. Jude's, Bradford; Incumbent of Eastgate-in-Weardale.
Eden, Rev. Frederick Nugent, M.A., Curate of St. James's, West Hartlepool; Curate-in-Charge of Norton.
Hamer, Rev. C. J., Vicar of St. John's, Bowling.
Hannam, Rev. William Robert, M.A., Vicar of Shelbrooke.
Haslam, Rev. J. H., Vicar of St. Matthias', Birmingham; Organiser and Director of Missions in South London.
Holden, Rev. Hubert A., M.A., LL.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Deputy Reader at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall.
Lathbury, Rev. Charles Edward, Vicar of St. Peter's, Aldborough Hatch, Essex.
Lindsay, Rev. William John Consmaker, B.A., Rural Dean of the South-Western Division of the Abergavenny Deanery.
Lucas, Rev. John Ponsonby, Rector of Rhossili; Rural Dean of West Gower, Glamorganshire.
Mason, Rev. A. L. A., Curate of All Saints', Cheltenham; Rector of Westley, Cambs.
Mason, Rev. J. E. S., Chaplain to the *Caroline*.
Merewether, Rev. William Arthur Scinde, M.A., Vicar of North Bradley.
Moriarty, Rev. J. H., Chaplain to the *Hyacinth*.
Nutt, Rev. John Henry, Rector of Harrietsham; Rural Dean of Sutton.
Ouseley, Rev, Sir Frederick Arthur Gore, Baronet, M.A.; Canon Residentiary in Hereford Cathedral.
Peart, Rev. W. F., M.A., Vicar of St. Michael's, Mytholmroyd; Vicar of Thornton Steward, Bedale.
Phillips, Rev. Evan Owen, M.A., Chancellor of St. David's Cathedral and Vicar of Aberystwith; Rector of Letterston-with-Llanfair Nantygol, Pembrokeshire.
Phillips, Rev. John, Vicar Choral of St. David's Cathedral; Sub-Dean of St. David's Cathedral.
Roberts, Rev. H. Seymour, LL.D. of Queens' College, Cambridge; Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Mar.
Scott, Rev. W. A., Vicar of Warmley.
Tatham, Rev. Thomas Crowther, B.A., Curate of Stockton-on-Tees; Incumbent of Sunnybrow.
Trist, Rev. George Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Silas's, Sculcoates, Hull.
Walsh, Rev. W., M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Newington; Superintendent and Secretary of the London Diocesan Home Mission.
White, Rev. Gilbert, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Charters Towers, North Queensland.
Woodhouse, Rev. Frederick C., M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Hulme; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Folkestone.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Baker-Carr, Rev. R. J., of Abberton Hall, Worcestershire, and Rector of Lanteglos and Advent, at Llanteglos Rectory, on the 19th inst., aged 58.
Bigge, Rev. George R., Vicar of Bolam, at Guernsey, on the 17th inst., aged 60.
Darnell, Rev. James, M.A., formerly Rector of Pentlow, at Tunbridge Wells, on the 17th inst., aged 81.
Kennedy, Rev. B. Sherard, of Stapleford Park, Melton Mowbray, at Walcote, Upper Norwood, on the 23rd inst., aged 54.
Manby, Rev. Aaron, B.A., formerly Vicar of Nidd, Yorkshire, and more recently Rector of Cottered, Herts, and Vicar of Nettlebed, Oxon, at Parkstone, Dorset, on the 22nd inst., aged 61.
M'Lean, Rev. Alexander Stuart, Vicar of the parish, at St. John's Vicarage, Longton, on the 22nd inst., aged 50.
Prichard, Rev. Robert Anwyl, at Thelveton Rectory, on the 21st inst., aged 72.
Sturman, Rev. Mark Cephas Tutet, B.A., at Ormsby Lodge, Southampton Street, Camberwell, on the 22nd inst., aged 52.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE POTTER AND THE CLAY.

By the Rev. AUGUSTUS W. GURNEY, M.A.,
Rector of Little Hereford, Tenbury.

Sermon Preached at Little Hereford.

"Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another to dishonour.—Romans ix. 21.

ST. PAUL'S Epistle to the Romans is at once the glory and the difficulty of the Church of God. In as far as it magnifies faith it is the glory of the Church; but in as far as its sweeping language lends itself to misinterpretation, it is the difficulty of the Church. It is not unlikely that St. Peter may have had an especial eye to the Epistle to the Romans, when, writing of St. Paul's Epistles generally, he used the following words, "In which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they also do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction, or rather their great injury." (2 Peter, iii. 16.) And to go no farther at this time than the very chapter from which the text is taken, the 9th of Romans, what contrasts does it not present to us!—what undoubted light and what seeming darkness, what manifest nobility of soul and what apparent yielding to superior force are to be found within its limits!

Can anything, I ask, more noble be conceived than St. Paul's wish to be "accursed from Christ for his brethren," as expressed in the 3rd verse, to the consideration of which I purpose to address myself on an early occasion? And, on the other hand, can anything seem, on the surface, more wanting in nobility than the argument concerning election, which argument comes to a head in the verse which I have chosen for my text. That same argument, taken in "the letter, which killeth," has proved to be the stronghold of a very narrow Calvinism. Now Calvinism, I need hardly tell you, brethren, the essence of it, consists in this blackest of aspersions on Almighty God,—the affirmation, namely, that the Creator has brought into the world certain souls positively foredoomed to everlasting sin and misery, and that though they should pray day and night, and serve God loyally to their life's end; whilst other souls, termed elect, are equally predestined, by a gigantic favouritism, to endless joy and life, independently of what they may do or leave undone. Surely, a doctrine to make wise men mad! Yes, and wise men have been made mad by it, not a few, who believed themselves foredoomed to everlasting burning. What a conception these must have had of God! But does the man now live who thinks himself

> Undone
> Before God fashioned star or sun?*

If so, let him shake off the thought, as he would resent the deadliest of insults to his Maker. "God will have all men to be saved"; and, subject only to the fetters of circumstance, man is free. Freedom is the mighty gift which God has bestowed upon us in His love and wisdom, at the fearful risk of our misuse. Free are we to stand and free to fall. Compulsion is of all things most shunned by God, on our behalf, unless indeed it be the compulsion of love. We may resist even that, if we will, both here and hereafter. But, as Divine love becomes more fully known to us, we may well trust that it will be our pride and glory, the one free impulse of each free soul, to return the love of God to the full; and what is more, God has revealed for a certainty that so it will be, for God is able. And have men fabled a God who exalts and debases the souls of men everlastingly, for no better reason than His sovereign will? Not any words can express my soul's abhorrence for such teaching. Shakespeare's man-monster, Caliban, might so act, if made ruler of the universe.† We may well ask, how could good men receive such a docrine? Yet it is certain that good and lovable men *did* receive Calvinism, as certain as that good and lovable men receive to this hour the tradition of certain elders as to everlasting punishment. But again let me ask, how could good men receive it? or how can good men receive that other tradition which I have named? Here is the answer, men have failed to understand that "God is Love." They have bowed their heads to an immense authority, a supposed fatal necessity, a very Juggernaut; they have distrusted the nobler instincts, the sure distinction between right and wrong, implanted in them by the Almighty, and have finally closed their hearts to pity, yet not without many a pang. I will now read to you the delusive justification of Calvinism, the very charter by which it stands or falls, as contained in the conclusion of St. Paul's famous argument, inclusive of the text: "Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, (Paul) why then doth He yet find fault? For who hath resisted His will? Nay but, O man, who

* Mr. Browning.

† See Mr. Robert Browning's "Caliban upon Setebos."

> *Caliban meditates upon a God such as himself,*
> Making and marring clay at will, so He.
> * * * *
> Am strong myself, compared with yonder crabs
> That march now from the mountain to the sea;
> Let twenty pass, and stone the twenty-first.
> Loving not, hating not, just choosing so.
> * * * *
> As it likes me each time, I do: so He.

art thou who repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, why hast Thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" (verses 18, 19, 20, 21.)

There, my brethren, we surely have, so far as the mere surface goes, and until we look into the depths beneath, what may be called the very height of injustice. I speak as to wise (or thinking) men; judge ye what I say. "What?" we might ask, "is man that can feel and think and aspire, to be likened to lifeless clay?" When God has, with seeming capriciousness, created us to dishonour instead of to honour, shall we not have so much as the feeble right to say, "Why hast thou made me thus?" When God has, as it might seem, wantonly "hardened" us, may we not cry in our misery, "Why doth God yet find fault? For who hath resisted His will?" It is as firm believers and devout lovers of God that we might be disposed to ask, "Shall God be indeed a tyrant?" It is well for Calibans and all admirers of sheer will and brute strength to grovel before superior force; but noble spirits demand in their God an equal mind, aye, and they find it too. If it were not so then rather let our puny defiance be sent to the feet of the Almighty. But, beloved, though these words of St. Paul lend themselves to misconstruction, their meaning *must* be noble and good, for God is love. It is impossible that free men should be called upon by St, Paul to bow down before superior force apart from everlasting right and truth. No, dear brethren, for the man who refused to do this, would, in such an impossible case, be nobler than his Maker! that is, nobler than the noblest, nobler than He that is all-noble, whose very Name is Love! more merciful than He who sent His only Son, at we know not what cost to His fatherly heart, to die, a willing victim, for the world's salvation. So then you see, brethren, the Calvinistic construction which is sometimes put upon St. Paul's words cannot be the right one, and it behoves us to apprehend the Apostle's real meaning. That meaning is, I think, clear; but if we could not find it, smiling trust would still be ours, for we should be none the less sure that God is Love, and that the God of the spirits of all flesh will do right, and administer a loving justice to all souls.

It is most true, then, that by the very circumstances of our birth some men are born unto honour, and some, in St. Paul's sense of the words, to dishonour. Take the case of the infant son of the late Duke of Albany, himself now the Duke, the Queen's youngest grandchild, who was born, so to speak, "in the purple" but a few months back (A.D. 1884), and then take the case of some infant born about the same time in a thieves' den. The one is born unto honour, is he not? and the other unto dishonour? The Divine Potter has fashioned the human clay according to His good pleasure. And yet—mark this, brethren—yet shall the infant born in a thieves' den have no cause eventually to reproach his Maker. And why? Because God will take into account all inequalities in pronouncing his final sentence. Yes, it is even so. The one infant, if it lives, will be brought up under every advantage, and the other, if it lives, under every disadvantage; the one infant will enter the kingdom of heaven upon earth by the new birth of water and the Spirit, and the other will remain unbaptised; the one guarded by affection from its birth, will become, it is likely, a pillar of the State; in any case we trust a truthful honourable gentleman and a Christian, though many a special temptation assails the great. The other, neglected from the first, brutalised, misled by vile example, may probably lead a thief's life and die in a drunken brawl or on the gallows. And yet, when this last stands before his Maker for judgment he shall have no cause to complain. No frown of the Almighty Judge, no sword of angel or of archangel will impose silence upon him in that hour. The prisoner at the bar shall have full liberty to pour out all his terrible wrongs, all the cruel hindrances of his lot in life, and yet he will not complain. And why not? Our Lord Himself shall tell us the reason. No lesser authority might suffice.

It is, you understand, my brethren, when the two infants being come to man's estate, shall stand before the throne of judgment for final sentence, that the mystery shall be made plain. Now give ear, and bow your hearts, and say "Of a truth the Lord's ways are equal," as you listen to our Master's words spoken in anticipation of that hour. (St. Luke xii.) "And that servant which knew his Lord's will and prepared not Himself, neither did according to His will, shall be beaten with many stripes." God forbid, brethren, that the late Duke of Albany's infant son, the son of so true-hearted a father, should come under the penalty of this most just sentence; but plainly, that is a penalty which we all must be prepared to face who know God's will, unless we do it. But how little can this particular penalty affect him who was born in a thieves' den. No, indeed, my brethren, the penalty which he is liable to incur has yet to be spoken, and here it is: "But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes." "Is not my way equal?" saith the Lord.

There is implanted by God in every man an innate craving for right and justice, this being the reflection of Divine equity. This craving cannot be fully contented here; its perfect satisfaction is therefore looked forward to hereafter in heaven. Nothing may take its place, not the harpings of angels upon their golden harps, no amount of clemency and indulgence exercised on our own personal behalf. And our Master's words

are full of the very spirit of equity. See in imagination, brethren, the smile of wonder and of hope creeping over the brutalised countenance of the lost and hardened wretch whose case we are considering when he understands this. See the beginning of his transformation before the Throne, if, indeed, that happy change did not rather begin in the place of departed spirits.

But let the change have begun when and where it might, he who was born to dishonour would feel at last that for him too, lost and despised as he seems, his Heavenly Father has bowels of mercy. So then, he would reflect, "Though the world was against me, God may yet be for me." He looks up and sees his Saviour, who is also his Judge, gazing tenderly upon him whilst speaking his merciful sentence, a sentence that shall surely form the delight of the holy angels, and no less of all of us, my brethren, to whom, it may be, a severer sentence shall be awarded for our sins of knowledge. Truly if there only burn one spark of sacred justice within our breast, whilst acknowledging how deserved is our own sentence, we shall hail with satisfaction the merciful sentence passed upon him who was created by the Almighty Potter "unto dishonour." And the very next words in St. Luke's Gospel explain yet more fully the grounds of God's perfect and unequalled justice: "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more."

There, dear brethren, I offer you a simple solution of one apparent difficulty in St. Paul's memorable argument about election contained in this 9th chapter of Romans. You see that though circumstance does greatly affect man's condition here in this life, and in time, yet in eternity God's love and mercy can and will set all straight; and no one affirms this more stoutly than St. Paul, the very burden or prevailing sentiment of whose deeper teaching may be said to be that "God is the Saviour of all men," even as "He will have all men to be saved." And believe me, those other things written by St. Paul which are "hard to be understood" are no less to be explained in the light of our Lord's sayings, in the light of the broader teaching of the great Apostle of the Gentiles himself, and in the light of the central truth that "God is love."

Before I end, brethren, it is only right for me to add, because it is the truth, that when at any time the Divine Potter has made a vessel of clay "unto dishonour," that is to say, has permitted a human being to be born and bred up under circumstances the most discouraging, and even the most degrading, it does not follow of necessity that the vessel thus made "unto dishonour" should not become a vessel "unto honour." Give ear, my brother or my sister, who by reason of your unhappy births may have seemed "made unto dishonour," if any such be present. For you I have a cheering, an inspiring message. There is no absolute reason why a thief's son should not become an honest man, nor yet why the daughter of a harlot should not grow up pure and chaste. No son, no daughter, is bound, is compelled, to follow in a parent's evil foot-steps, but is at liberty to strike out a nobler path for him or herself. And that is what thousands have done, with the Holy Spirit's aid. To counteract bad example, potent as this is, God has placed in every breast a silent witness for right and truth—the conscience namely, and this in a Christian land can never be quite silenced. No doubt there will be serious and even terrible difficulties to be surmounted. The horse that is heavily weighted is not *likely* to win the race; but if he wins it, or if he does but run straight, he deserves double honour. And in like manner, if he that was "made unto dishonour" lives "unto honour," surely he shall deserve and receive double reverence at the hands of men and of angels. Do most of us, on the other hand, rightly conceive ourselves to be "made unto honour," having parents of good repute, and being brought betimes under the influence of our holy religion, then let it be our proudest aim to stretch out a helping hand to such as are made "unto dishonour."

One thing more. Let us not fail to remember how much deeper will be our fall than theirs, if, being blessed with every advantage over those others, we yet have not the gift of perseverence. Twice miserable shall they be who, being made "unto honour," shall unmake themselves "unto dishonour." Twice blessed shall they be who, being made "unto dishonour," shall live "unto honour." What lover of God can question that even as a human parent's affection is commonly called forth in a high degree on behalf of a sickly, stunted, suffering child, so also our heavenly Father's heart goes forth very specially to all who are made "unto dishonour?" There is Divine pity for their sins, there is Divine sympathy with their feeblest efforts and struggles for the right; there is Divine joy in their complete recovery, be it here or hereafter. And over each and all that live the most just God shall hold the scales of justice and of mercy in equal balance—always remembering that by merit none of us should see salvation, and that our unworthiness can only be accepted in Christ Jesus our Saviour and Redeemer.

So then here is the conclusion of the matter. The Divine Potter has the power to mould the clay as He thinks fitting, but only for this life. Hereafter He will make good those losses to the weak and degraded which arise from circumstance. and for which they are not in any true and deep sense responsible. But, beloved, let *us* remember who may conceive ourselves to be born "unto honour," that a talent is entrusted to one and all of us; and the talent we possess we are bound to

use for the benefit of our brother-men, and for the honour and glory of our God.

## ON WASTE IN NATURE.

By Rev. T. G. BONNEY, M.A., F.R.S., P.G.S. and Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall.

"To what purpose is this waste?"—St. Matthew xxvi. 8.

THESE words, as you no doubt remember, were spoken on a memorable occasion when the Saviour's mission to this earth was drawing near to its close. One of those who loved Him best, Mary the sister of Lazarus, had anointed Him with a costly unguent as He reclined at the evening meal; and the disciples thus criticised what she had done. How they were answered by their Lord you doubtless recollect. To-day, however, I do not purpose to dwell upon the relation of this phrase to the incident with which it was first connected, but to regard it in a wider sense, as an outcome of a critical spirit which has been familiar to the world at most periods of history. To what purpose, for what reason, is this waste? is the question by which not a few persons sum up the result of their view of life, of this world, and its government. It is a question asked, sometimes in mockery, sometimes in sadness; a question which may be put by with ease in our brightest, lightest hours, but which rises with a strange force, and is instant with a dread persistency in hours of weakness, of solitude, and of sorrow.

The mood of which it is the outcome, as you probably remember, has been expressed by one of our living poets in his tuneful analysis of human sorrow. We trust, he says,

> That nothing walks with aimless feet,
> That not one life shall be destroyed
> Or cast as rubbish to the void,
> When God hath made the pile complete . . .

But then to our minds, as to his, arises before long the dread misgiving which he goes on to express in the following question:—

> Are God and Nature then at strife,
> That Nature lends such evil dreams,
> So careful of the type she seems
> So careless of the single life . . . ?
>
> So careful of the type? but no,
> From scarped cliff and quarried stone
> She cries, "A thousand types are gone,
> I care for nothing, all shall go."

"All shall go." Yes, that too often seems this world's doom. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; death and life, birth and the grave, weave their endless web of threads dark and light; one generation of man passeth away, and another ariseth. As when an abundant spring is welling up from the earth, bubble after bubble, leaping to the surface, glances for one moment in the sunshine, and then breaks and is gone, so life after life seems to come from the secret womb of earth and vanish, whither we do not know!

Thoughts such as these at times are almost inevitable, for mental depression and disquietude are as sure factors in life as the body. Let us then see whether from what we do know—apart from what is revealed—we may not make some answer—may not lay hold of some ground of hope.

It is of course always possible to meet such questions by an appeal to our ignorance? we may retort upon the critic, who complains of the waste of force in nature, that he is challenging the execution of a plan which he is incapable of comprehending—God's ways are not as our ways, nor His thoughts as our thoughts. The rebuke, for such it really is, under certain circumstances is a just one. For us to sit in judgment on the system of government of the Universe is at least as unwise as for a child to censure a system of philosophy. We must admit at the outset that our ignorance prevents us from coming to a conclusion. Stand on some clear night beneath the open canopy of heaven, and gaze upon the myriad stars that stud the black concave: what know we of their function in the Universe, or of those yet more numerous planets which may be circling round each one of these far distant suns? We cannot even conjecture the future of this one globe, whereon we move; we do but dimly know its past; we cannot track the spirit after life's last sigh has been drawn: how then shall we impute foolishness to the Almighty, or call the works of His hands ill-contrived.

Still, it cannot be denied that an answer such as this leads to a result wholly negative; we do but conclude

> . . . . we know not anything,
> [We] can but trust that good shall fall
> At last—far off—at last to all,
> And every winter change to spring.

It is an answer which may be made to the shallow scoffer, but should not he given, except in suggestion, to the earnest inquirer. Such there undoubtedly are; for even as a loving and obedient child may sometimes be justly perplexed by the actions of his parent, so we too may find it hard to comprehend the ways of Him, who is so far above us. May we not then sometimes be able to do more than smother doubt? Is it not worth while looking to see whether, within the range of our knowledge, there may not be instances where the apparent waste of the past has been found to be the sustenance of the present?

I will take two instances from nature and two from history to illustrate my meaning. At first sight, what can be more prodigal than the expenditure of energy in the solar system? The sun, for example, during unknown myriads of years has been radiating light and heat all around into space, of which but a small part reaches this earth. There seems waste here; but admitting, as I

suppose all will do, that the sun is as necessary to the working of the solar system as the mainspring is to the watch; that upon its radiance depend the rains of heaven, and ultimately the life of every creature upon the earth: can we conceive any other order of things which would not require the expenditure of an equal amount of energy, which would be at once so simple in principle, and so perfect in its results, as the present constitution of the solar system? I have certainly never seen such an attempt made. Further, this earth, as we now see it, is indirectly a result of the energy expended in the past. The mountain peak and the sequestered valley are alike monuments of the work which that has done; the very rocks themselves in many a case hold it, as it were in store, for use in the future. Seeing, then, that the existing constitution of things commends itself to us on examination, and that which appeared waste not seldom more nearly resembles providence—are we not justified in doubting whether even the apparent waste is real waste? May there not be a purpose even for that energy which seems to be dissipated in the worldless void—for those pulses of light which seem at last to throb themselves to rest in that illimitable ocean of apparently lifeless space?

Again, suppose we transport ourselves in imagination back to an epoch very far away in this earth's history, long before man walked upon its surface, long before land and sea had assumed their present configuration; let us imagine ourselves standing, as one might then have stood, on some hill of primæval rock in the centre of what is now England. From this insular outlook our eyes range far and wide over a vast marshy plain, densely clothed by a strange vegetation, a land of jungle and reed-bed, of lagoon and morass. No birds hover over this gigantic fen, no beasts useful to man can be found within its borders, nay, perchance his foot could not tread the quaking surface, his life not long resist the malarious air. There is life indeed, but it is soulless and useless: "Wherefore then all this waste?" So we may imagine some mocking spirit of evil—if such there were—to have exclaimed as he gazed over this part of the earth.

Change now the scene to later days, when man has appeared on earth. Stand once more on the same hill, and look around over the dry land which has replaced those endless marshes. Changed by long entombment, transformed by the secret chemistry of nature, the profuse and seemingly wasteful plant-growth has become the fuel which gives health and wealth to thousands, for that desolate morass is now one of the coalfields of England.

This single instance may suffice, for others will readily suggest themselves, as showing how the apparent waste of the distant past has become the buried treasure for the present. How, then, when we look upon the world around us, wherein the same processes of life and death are being continued, can we venture to assert that they are purposeless? We know nothing of the future of this earth; we know not how many æons it has to run, or what the connection will be between it and the new earth prepared for the regenerate in Christ; but inasmuch as we find the past working into the present in a way so marvellous that we cannot regard it as a result of blind chance, but as a part of an ordered plan—to use the words which we should apply to our own relations—may we not boldly say, "It is true that 'we know not anything,' but yet 'we trust'—and that not faintly—'the larger hope?'"

Let us now take two examples from the history of our race: let us go back some sixteen centuries, to the time of the Decian or the Diocletian persecutions. We see hundreds of persons—not only aged men and women, but also those in the prime of life, and even in the first bloom of youth—hundreds pure and innocent, the very salt of the earth—giving themselves up willingly to die, and that often by the keenest tortures—only for a matter of opinion, as it would seem to the careless onlooker. If these misguided enthusiasts would but have contented the prejudices of their generation, if they would but have cast a few grains of incense into the fire, they might have thought what they liked, and have gone on with their teaching of morality, by that most efficacious of all preaching, the example of a pure and innocent life. Wherefore was all this waste?

Be it so, there seems to be a waste; yet, as man is constituted, is there any lesson so impressive to him as the daring to die? Is not the saying, "The blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church," true again and again in cases where no religious belief is directly concerned? Surely the lesson of self-sacrifice in any cause appeals at once to all that is noble in man—or else the three hundred fell in vain beneath the Persian spears at Thermopylæ, and the inscription on their tomb spake only to the winds.*

One more instance, for which we go back some two centuries further. A crowd is gathered outside the gates of Jerusalem; they are gazing, some in scorn, some in sorrow, on a man nailed to a cross, dying in a slow agony. We ask His offence, and learn that His short life may be summed up in this one sentence, "He went about doing good;" but He made Himself obnoxious to those in high places, He denounced the vices of the great, and exposed the hypocrisies of the professionally pious with too little reticence; He advanced opinions on theological questions, and claimed for Himself an authority in things spiritual, which aroused the jealousy of the constituted

* Ὦ ξεῖν, ἄγγειλον Λακεδαιμονίοις, ὅτι τῇδε
Κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων πειθόμενοι νομίμοις.

authorities, and gave them an opportunity of bringing Him to death. So now His life of usefulness is prematurely ended, and the grave must receive Him on whom many had counted to deliver Israel. Wherefore is this waste? might well be asked.

The first response to the question was in this case not long in coming: in the dawning of the first Easter morn the gates of the grave were burst asunder, the earnest of the redemption of more than Israel was given; for

> Captivity was captive led
> [When] Jesus lived who was dead.

I do not now appeal, owing to the limitation which I have imposed upon myself, to the relation of this death to the mystery of man's redemption, but simply ask whether—his nature being what it is—anything can be conceived which would have appealed to all that is best within him with such an overwhelming power as the death of Christ upon the Cross.

I am indeed aware that an objector may go on to ask in these cases, But why is the world so constituted, that this cyclic change of death and life is needful? Why is man's nature so constituted, that the sacrifice of the few should lead to the good of the many?

Here I must admit myself incapable of giving an answer. We can only deal with things as they are. We might possibly conceive of a system of worlds constituted in accordance with the law, that matter should repel instead of attract; but of such we have had no experience, and it is idle to speculate. Things, however, being as they are, I maintain that amid some apparent anomalies, and a great number of matters which are at present (and perhaps always will be) incomprehensible, we can discern enough to enable us to say, "Thou lovest all the things that are, and abhorrest nothing which thou hast made. . . . Thou sparest all, for they are thine, O Lord, thou lover of souls."*

Where, then, can we venture to assert positively that there is waste? In the flowers that gem the lonely mountain crags, or bloom unseen in the trackless savannahs; in the life that teems on earth, in air, or in water? In the soul that lingers in its mortal garb too short a time for love, for friendship, or for fame? Is there no meaning in the words which describe how, at the world's creation, the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy? No hope of a better life behind the veil? Nay, dare we say if even the seeming waste of our own lives, the lost opportunities, the unsatisfied longings, the unfulfilled aspirations, may not oftener than we think, prove at last

> That all, as in some piece of art,
> Is toil coöperant to an end.

We end our consideration, as we began, with a confession of ignorance, but of an ignorance that is hopeful, instead of hopeless. And between these two positions there is a more than world-wide difference. There is the difference between hate and love, between distrust and trust. In the one case we sorrow without hope, and we wander without light; this life is a dreary puzzle, and the next is a blank: in the other case, while trials and perplexities still remain, while we daily find many things too hard for us, we know that there is a glory behind the clouds, an arm to support, which, though unseen, will never fail, and a love deeper and truer than earth can give, which knows no variableness, neither shadow of turning.

Would that we could fully persuade ourselves of this. It may seem but a small advance to have made in Christian development. Compared with the strong meat of much theological dogma, such a simple thing as this may seem the veriest milk for babes; but yet experience shows most of us full well how true, and yet how hard is the saying, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Yes, just as a child in those early years when all is fresh and alluring, and no thorn is supposed to lurk beneath the rose-leaves, when everything invites the dawning senses to make trial of the unknown, may often be seen, after much play and some waywardness, to throw himself weary and disappointed into a parent's arms, and there repose with a sense of peace and satisfaction, never before so fully realised; so must we, sooner or later—whatever our age or our rank may be—seek, in the same spirit of trust, the eternal arms, praying—"Father, forgive me, for I am wayward and erring; comfort me, for I am weary and sorrow-stricken; strengthen me, for I am weak and wounded; let me but know that Thou lovest me, and then Thy will be done."

* Wisdom xi. 24, 26.

---

WE are requested to state that the Dean of Westminster will resume his lectures on the Book of Job at half-past three on Saturday afternoon, the 6th inst.

THE Dean of Westminster, Canon Westcott, and the President of Trinity College, Oxford, have consented to act as a committee of selection for the head mastership of King's School, Paramatta, Sydney, which will be vacant next June. The head master must be a graduate in honours at Oxford or Cambridge, in priest's orders. The school, which is about fourteen miles from Sydney, is the oldest Church school in the colony.

THE nomination of Archdeacon Darby to the Deanery of Chester is among the best, as it will be the last, of Lord Salisbury's ecclesiastical appointments. The new Dean is one of the hardest workers in the diocese. His labours as Archbishop's Inspector of Training Colleges have been unremitting; he is already most favourably known in the Northern Convocation; and he has been the intimate friend and trusted helper of two successive Bishops. Lord Salisbury deserves just praise for a striking instance of promotion by merit alone.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1886.

## CRITICISM.

WE have a very high opinion of the salutary effects of criticism. A speaker or writer who invites and welcomes it submits himself to a course of most wholesome discipline. He finds his weak points strengthened, his ignorances enlightened, and Himself in many ways corrected and improved. Thus, when we apply outspoken and unsparing criticism to all our conspicuous clerics, we do what is best for them, and are treating others precisely as we wish to be treated ourselves. There is nothing that we enjoy more than assisting at the *post mortem* of one of our own articles. And our contributor, who furnished the review on Archbishop Benson's charge, assures us that not only does he not resent the strictures of "Presbyter," but that he has taken quite as much interest in his own dissection as he did in that of the Archbishop. He adds, that in his articles he often angles for the critics—introduces a statement or expression which he thinks may provoke their animadversions, and feels somewhat disappointed if his fishes do not rise. This appetite for criticism is by no means an uncommon feeling. It is related in "Greville's Memoirs" that Lord Brougham once caused to be inserted in the newspapers a fictitious account of his own death in a railway accident; in order that he might read his own obituary notices, and know what the critics would say of him after he was dead. The same sort of feeling comes to a man who has written a book or an article, or has preached a sermon—"I should like to know what people will think of this production of mine." And to such the adverse criticisms are more acceptable than the favourable ones. It is with feelings like these that we ourselves apply outspoken criticism to those who seem to be pillars of the Church, and invite the same discipline for our own writings. Nothing but good can result from such an interchange of give and take. Even a dignitary is capable of improvement, and the knowledge that his acts and statements are sure to be well heckled, and that if he does an absurd thing he will be ridiculed, will make him learn all the faster to abstain rom that which provokes unfavourable criticism. If every Monday's newspapers reviewed every Sunday's sermons, and cut up severely a few conspicuous victims amongst the preachers, the quality of pulpit discourses would improve rapidly. To return to the occasion of this article—if "Presbyter" finds fault with our reviewer's interpretation of Acts xix. 2, let him try his hand at furnishing a translation of the verse, without adding italics such as the revisers introduce, or any supplementary words or glosses of his own. If he objects to our reviewer calling the Archbishop an *homunculus*, let him demonstrate him to be *vir magnus*. If he thinks the Joannean creed unfairly described as a work of imagination, let him show it to be a creation of solid thought and logical reasoning. And so with the other statements of our reviewer, and the other points in his examination of the Archbishop. Our rule of action in this, as in all other subjects, is free discussion all round, on every subject, and for every writer and thinker.

## CHURCH REFORM.

LAST Tuesday week an address, signed by 164 beneficed clergy of the diocese of Norwich, headed by Dean Goulburn and Prebendary Meyrick, was presented to the Bishop. It was to the following effect:—

"We beg leave, with all due respect for the opinion of the many eminent men—all of them our brethren in the ministry—who have addressed your Lordship on the subject of Church reform, to express our entire dissent from their conclusions, and our apprehension of the hazards to which the Church will be exposed by the line of action which they recommend.

"Without at all denying that temperate measures of reform are needed in certain parts of our ecclesiastical system, we think that the present period is a most unsuitable one in which to press for such measures. None of the suggested reforms can be carried through without the action of Parliament, and we hope that we may say, without any disloyalty to the powers that be, that the attitude towards the Church of a Parliament elected as this has been, though of course it cannot be foreseen with absolute certainty, is not likely to be friendly or favourable. It is not as if Churchmen could have the control and guidance of the desired alterations, while they are being shaped. When once we have invited legislation and committed ourselves to it, the Legislature will do, not what to us, but what to it seems good.

"With regard to the Cambridge address to the Archbishops and Bishops, to which our brethren refer, while we are quite aware that the signatories are some of the most eminent men of their day in point of literary and scientific attainments, we take the liberty of questioning whether many of them have had that experience of the practical working of a parish which alone can qualify a man to speak upon points directly bearing upon parochial organisation and administration.

"We should not be candid if we did not add that to one or more of the alterations which have been suggested in the system of the Church, we entertain the strongest objections, though, as (for the reasons

above stated) we think any movement in the present crisis to be undesirable, and that the strength of the Church is 'to sit still,' we do not feel called upon to enter into particulars."

The Bishop of Norwich has returned the following reply to this and the address which we published on January 13 :—

"I received about a fortnight since an address signed by nearly six hundred of the clergy, expressing their earnest desire that steps should be taken without delay for ensuring timely and sufficient reform in our Church, and suggesting that a special meeting of the Diocesan Conference would afford a convenient opportunity for the consideration of such reform.

"I also received yesterday morning a requisition to convoke a special meeting of the Diocesan Conference to consider the question of Church reform, signed by a considerable number of influential members of the conference, both of the clergy and the laity.

"Further, I received in the afternoon another address upon the same subject, signed by 160 of the clergy dissenting from the opinions and recommendations of the first address above mentioned, and, while admitting that temperate measures of reform are needed in certain parts of our ecclesiastical system, regarding the present period as most unsuitable one in which to press for such measures.

"I have thought it to be for the convenience of all parties that I should delay to give any reply to the first address until I had received the two which followed it.

"There can be no doubt that Church reform is a subject of the highest importance both to the Church and to the nation. The desire for reform in any body, ecclesiastical or civil, generally felt and expressed, is a hopeful sign of life and vigour, and claims at the hands of all members of the body, and especially of those in authority, earnest consideration and prayer for divine guidance, that any measures for effecting the good desired may not only be well-intentioned but well-directed and well-timed, not only desirable in themselves but adapted to our present condition and needs.

"I wholly concur with the opinion that a special meeting of our conference would afford a suitable opportunity for considering the subject in this diocese, and I am quite prepared to comply with the requisition which has been addressed to me to convoke a special meeting of conference for that purpose. I do not regard the difference of opinion upon the subject expressed in the second address as making such a step inexpedient, but rather as an additional reason for adopting it.

"It remains, therefore, to decide what will be the most suitable time for the conference to meet. in my address to the diocese in November last, I suggested 'as soon as possible after Easter,' and I gave my reasons.

"Parliament is now assembled, and already more than one notice has been given of measures affecting the Church. Convocation meets for business February 16th, and Church Reform will probably be a primary subject to be dealt with. The cathedral body this afternoon, and the Archdeacons and Rural Deans tomorrow, will meet to give me their counsel and opinion upon this subject, and I purpose to submit it in some shape to the consideration of the forty-three ruridecanal meetings of the diocese, at which nearly 1,000 clergy and more than 2,000 of the laity are invited to attend and give me their opinion.

"Easter week, especially the latter part of it, is comparatively free from public or from Parliamentary business, and by that time we shall be in possession of what has been said and proposed at Convocation, in Parliament, and in our diocese. I propose. therefore, as at present advised, to suggest to the General Purposes Committee that a special meeting of the Diocesan Conference should be convoked for the Thursday and Friday in Easter week.

"Suffer me in the meantime to exhort you to be much in prayer for our nation, our Church, and our diocese; and, commending you to the guidance and blessing of Almighty God, I remain, your faithful brother in the Lord, "JOHN T. NORWICH.

"The Palace, Norwich, January 27, 1866."

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### SEMI-CHRISTIAN SCEPTICISM IN THE *TIMES*.

SIR,—The weak and trifling scepticism which marked the famous "Essays and Reviews," and culminated in Professor Jowett's paper, has its representatives still among the elder clergy, fossil souvenirs of a past era, and manifests itself conspicuously in a review of recent sermons in the *Times* for the 28th of January. There the writer coolly remarks of Mark Pattison, speaking with all the vague authority of the "We" of the leading newspaper: "He *felt* that Revelation, that is, the Bible, cannot stand the critical test, and that the chief figure in that splendid vision (namely, Christ the Lord) has no claims beyond what historical criticism and sound ethics may allow." And these, I presume, only allow, as Browning has scornfully suggested, something differing fundamentally from what was understood by all who heard Him and loved Him, and beheld their risen Lord, and died for Him, that He was sent by the Father as His only begotten Son, and one with the Father as God.

Now, sir, it is time to tell these scientists and sceptics plainly that they are unhappily deficient in ordinary judgment, and obviously incapable, from prejudice, of facing a plain issue. It is too true that Divine truth has been abused by a narrow clericalism, and confounded with a hideous superstition, a heresy that practically denied a God of Love. Yet, by the grace of God, the Church Catholic stands in no way committed to a definition of aeonial life and death and, at every time, great fathers and teachers have been found to uphold the essential truth, that ultimately good and right shall triumph and "God be All in all."

Again, it is not to be doubted that the essential inspiration of Holy Scripture has been stated in too unqualified a form. The divisions of Christendom rendered it hard to perceive the essential oneness of Catholic teaching in the creeds, and the value of spiritual and sacramental life. Men who see strongly any one aspect of truth are always tempted to deny all others. Hence Anglican narrowness, as represented specially by Dr. Liddon, fails to discern Christian life and love in Presbyterian and other Reformed channels. Hence those who dwell on rational perceptions or spiritual intuitions are apt to denounce al

sacramental worship. The *Times* writer has no right to make the Bible synonymous with Revelation, for this it is not. The Bible, the Church, and the conscience and intellect of Christendom, together make a three-fold cord, that cannot be broken. But what is really intolerable is the quiet assumption on the part of small half-sceptics, that they only are in possession of free thought and accurate knowledge.

I am compelled to tell these gentlemen, writing with my name and in all courtesy, that only weak or strongly-prejudiced intellects can fail, in my opinion, to discern the marvellous unity and Divine origin of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, the testimony of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles to the Son of God. As for any impartial mind contemplating the records of our Lord and Master's work, and denying His Divinity, I hold this to be simply impossible, save under the influence of the vulgar but widespread error, that Almighty power can only work by laws or causes partially known by man. This is the first principle proclaimed by Renan, Strauss, Reville, and all Continental unbelievers; and I must add, that a more foolish and utterly baseless notion never entered the mind of man. The Supreme God and Father acts through many secondary causes, of which we are utterly unable to trace the sequence or origin. Indeed, we can never discover a first cause of any kind, though it is certain first causes must exist. This Continental superstition of the powerlessness of God to reveal Himself is at the bottom of our feeble half-believers'-strictures. These gentlemen conceit themselves to occupy a position of superiority to Christians. They patronise archbishops, deans, and canons, and laud unhappy Pattisons as the wisest of (would-be) theologians. These well-meaning, but weak writers must learn that their objections are really out of date. They are derived from a reaction from an exclusive Bibliolatry. The word of God is inspired; but we have the Divine treasure in earthen vessels. Elements of weakness and imperfection adhere to the sacred history, though in the main it has the transparency of truth. What is lacking here in logical exactness is supplied by the unconscious testimony of the whole Church of God, and, above all, by the wonderful holiness and Divine purity of Christ our Lord and Master. *He* is ever going forth, conquering and to conquer, in His Word, in His Church, in the heart and conscience of humanity, and these half-believers of anonymous criticism should accept the warning, that their destructive work, such as it is, or was, is done, and has not affected, and never can affect, the essential truth and glory of that Faith, that was in the beginning delivered to the Saints. ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
January 28, 1886.

## THE IRISH QUESTION.

SIR,—Will you allow me to make some little remark on the letter of Rev. A. Gurney in to-day's PULPIT?

I state (if angrily, yet I hope I sin not, though I am not conscious of anger in the premises) that there is no such thing as an Irish nation, because the two peoples, the natives and the colonists, have never mixed. The Britons, Saxons, Northmen, etc., of England have mixed, and by the mixture have produced the English nation. Your correspondent's *à fortiori* is on my side. If there be any one characteristic of nationality, without which no nationality can be, it is unity. If there be any one characteristic of the inhabitants of Ireland, taken as a sum, it is the want of unity. The list of names cited by your correspondent contains only one Irishman, Moore, and he was a poor creature. The others were all *Englishmen born in Ireland.* I refer to Swift's indignant disclaimer of the name of Irishman, because he was born in Dublin. My ancestors, so far as I can trace them, on one side for 250 years, on the other side for 400 years, have been unadulterated English. (Not that I intend to compare myself with Grattan, Palmerston, etc.)

The answer of "the people here," that is, in Ulster, to *any plan of Home Rule whatever*, will be, "We won't have it." They *know*—your correspondent can only conjecture on the subject—that any plan of it whatever will be bad, and all but ruinous if carried into effect. They will not recognise the authority of any Dublin Assembly or the like, and will take up arms rather than submit to it.

Mr. Gurney believes "not only in a universal Divine presence of our Lord and Saviour, but also in a specific sacramental presence, as the Lamb that was slain at every altar." I believe the same. So do not many millions, both in this country and in England. When your correspondent proceeds to say, "the Irish Anglican Church has been living without this immediate worship for three centuries," I must take some exception. We are not "the Irish Anglican Church," we are the Church of Ireland. I object to be called by a nickname. We have not been living for three centuries, or for one day upon which the Eucharist has been celebrated, without Eucharistic worship. Does Mr. Gurney mean to say, that because the majority (as I will admit) of communicants do not entertain his and my belief concerning the Real Presence, therefore there is no Eucharistic worship? As for prayers for the dead, neither my Church nor his has them, quite rightly, as I think. As for the Church of England not being popular, I know that it is not popular with political dissenters, Bradlaughites, etc.; I had thought that it is popular with the best part of Englishmen of all, or nearly all classes. Our Church, whether popular or not, is the object of the strong attachment of its members.

Mr. Gurney is entirely right in his condemnation of any and every plan of buying out the landowners of this country. I do not know what the fatal economic policy of late years, of which he speaks, is. If he mean the last Land Act, I completely agree with him. The most prosperous period that Ireland ever knew was from 1850 till 1880, during which time sound Free Trade principles governed the conduct of affairs. Most of our present evils arose from setting them at naught. SUBSCRIBER.

Armagh, January 30th, 1886.

P.S.—Mr. Gurney speaks (can he be serious) of William the Third having conquered England. In that King's reign, a pamphlet was issued that uttered something of the kind, and the author was put in the pillory.

## JAMES V. 11.

SIR,—The question raised recently in your pages about the interpretation of this passage is one of some interest, though it is not an easy one to settle. In

such a matter evidence both external and internal requires consideration. Something may be said for the reading ἴδετε (contained in A. B. corr[1], etc., and approved by many textual critics), for the received εἴδετε, which may modify much that has been written with reference to the distinction between the acts of "hearing of" and "seeing." The internal evidence is largely on the side of the interpretation that the "end" refers to the completed work and sufferings of the Lord Himself. This view has had supporters both in ancient and modern times. The main arguments are these : (1.) In verse 11 the context speaks of those who *endured* (ὑπομείναντας being by far the best attested reading, being found in ℵ, A. B., Syr., and Vulg.). The form of the participle takes us back into the past, and suggests a *class* of sufferers. The plural scarcely suits an application to an individual, which would be the case if Job only were under consideration. (2.) The end endured by the Lord would properly be set in opposition to the charge contained in the 6th verse, of the Jews having condemned and murdered the Just One. (3.) Christ's mercy was especially manifested in His sufferings endured for us. (4.) If viewed chronologically all will fall into order; Job was the first great sufferer, for we may suppose that the Jewish Christian writer, whichever of the James's was the author of this Epistle, would take the same view of the authorship of the Book of Job as the Talmud does. Job was a type in his humiliation, sufferings, and triumph. Christ was the last great sufferer, the antitype stooping from heaven, bearing the Cross and exalted to glory. Between the type and antitype is included the whole race of those who endured. Just as in Matt. xxiii. 35, our Lord advances Abel as the first martyr recorded in the first book of the Hebrew Canon, and Zechariah in the last book of the Canon, all martyrs between the two being included. (5.) The word τέλος must not be limited to our familiar use of the word "end," as merely denoting *finality*, *termination*, etc., but in connection with St. James's use of the kindred adjective and verb as implying *completeness*, *fulfilment*, etc., viz., of Christ's work and office and ministry. From all these considerations it is most probable that St. James is setting before us the Divine Exemplar in these words.

The only really strong objection to this view is that the Peshitto-Syriac version has a most emphatic rendering on the other side. The text may be translated literally, "You have heard of the patience of Job, and the end which the Lord wrought for him you have seen." There is some considerable ground for believing that this Epistle was written originally in Syriac, and if so, the testimony of this Syriac text would be of great weight. It is only fair, however, to add that the old Latin version of this Epistle, found in the Corbey MS., ff[1], which is supposed to have been derived from a Syriac original, has the same rendering in this passage as the Vulgate, "finem Domini vidistis," which is, of course, indefinite.

F. TILNEY BASSETT, M.A.,
Prebendary of Wells and Vicar of Dulverton.
January 27, 1886.

## REFORM OR DISESTABLISHMENT.

SIR—The Archbishop of York says, "Do not press reform from fear of disestablishment." Why not? If disestablishment would evilly affect the spiritual health of the nation, would not even his Grace "fear" it, and act on his fear, as a Christian man and a patriot? If disestablishment would merely affect ourselves personally, we ought not to act as if it were a national question. But who does put forth selfish interests, and who does wish by reform to save the Church and State connection for his own personal ends? Are we not all, including Liberationists, acting on high public principle? Who ever heard, throughout this most exciting controversy, of a Nonconformist who wants to disestablish the Church out of self-interest or jealousy or personal pique? And who ever heard of a Churchman who subscribes to the Defence Association, or advocates reform because he is afraid for himself, his prestige and position, his parsonage and perquisites, his big "squire's" pew in the church, or his interest as patron? Are we not honourable men—"*all* honourable men"? Then why should we not, if we are "afraid" that disestablishment would be bad for the country at large, press for reform out of simple, naked "fear," clad in the vesture of absolute certainty that if reform does not come and heal us, the two D's will come and put an end to our State connection? When rustics down here in Buckinghamshire don't want to fight, they say, "Will you promise not to 'summons' me? I'm not afraid of *you*, but only of being 'summonsed;'" and so they get out of a contest. In like manner our Church dignitaries get out of reform, saying, "I am not afraid of reform, you know; but only of being thought afraid of those two awful D's." No man, not even a dignitary of the Church of England, who is really fearless, need go out of his way, or need shackle any noble impulse to convince people that he is "not afraid." In fact, there are disbelieving spirits among us who the more we say we are not afraid, the more will believe we are. They are misguided folk, no doubt, but uncommonly shrewd and keen in other judgments.

S. B. JAMES.

Northmarston, January 28, 1886.

## THE REAL PRESENCE—THE CHURCH CATECHISM.

SIR,—Manning's answer to Leslie's "Case Stated" is a clever, one-sided book. It prefers the favourite query of the Romanist, What about the words of the Church Catechism, "the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper"? On these words I beg leave to make a few remarks.

It is true that the Eucharist is a memorial, or a commemoration; but that does not touch the answer in the Catechism. Our Lord's words, no doubt, are figurative; "this is My Body." They *must* be so. They cannot *assert* a fact which they also *cause*. If they turn bread into His Body, they are not true, as an assertion, "this is now My Body."

2. But we are still to explain the words of the Catechism, "verily and indeed taken and received." Whatever they mean cannot contradict those other words, that our Lord's Body is in Heaven, and cannot possibly at the same time be anywhere else. Our Lord says, John vi. 62, 63, speaking of eating His flesh, "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." When Ridley was on his trial, he told his judges he held with them that our Lord's Body was present in the

Eucharist. The only question was, *how?* By spirit and grace, he said.

3. The favourite illustration of Cranmer, and our divines since, is that of the sun, which, distant locally, is present by its light and warmth. A grace from Christ's Body, or an influence of the Holy Spirit, accompanying the bread and wine, entitle them to be called the Body and Blood of Christ. See Bull and Waterland. Even Romanists must acknowledge that, without such a Divine influence, it would profit us nothing to eat, if it were possible, even our Lord's actual flesh.

4. If any one can give any other explanation of the words of the Catechism, except Transubstantiation, I shall be much indebted to him. We must not allow Romanists to tell us to our faces that we oppose not them only, but the express words of our own Catechism.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

## Reviews and Notices.

"CHURCH ECHOES." By Mrs. Carey Brock. Seeley & Co. Pp. 459.

ANYTHING that comes from the pen of this gifted authoress, is especially worthy of notice. And therefore we hail with pleasure this most interesting volume, which is a tale illustrative of the Daily Service of the Book of Common Prayer.

There is a great deal of what is generally known as the goody-goody literature, which is made up of sentiment and emotionalism (if we may use the phrase), but which does not penetrate beneath the surface, and show things in their true light; and therefore anything that is out of the beaten track is especially welcome. The introductory chapter describes in a graphic manner a district called Little Barton, godless and profane, which was suddenly aroused to life and action by the erection of an iron church; and the character of one David Graham, a truly pious man, is true and life-like to a degree.

It is not to our purpose to enter fully into the various details of the story before us, because that would far exceed the space at our disposal. We can only say that it shows how very real the Prayer-Book is, and how that it supplies the wants of all. The chapter on the Apostles' Creed is extremely interesting, for we cannot but feel that many repeat it Sunday after Sunday, and day by day, without ever thinking of the great truths which are contained in it. So, again, we may refer to the chapter which deals with the Prayer for the High Court of Parliament, as being very interesting, for if there was a time in the history of this country when Parliament needed praying for, surely it is now, when an avowed atheist has been allowed to take the oath, and when there are others who are anxious to destroy the Church, and drag our holy religion in the mire. Not that we are to condemn the House of Commons, as Thomas Carlyle has done, when he speaks of it, as so many speaking asses set to rule the affairs of the greatest nation in the world, but we believe that in these critical times prayer is needed, that all things may be over-ruled for the best.

There are several chapters on the Litany, which is so comprehensive and sublime, and we believe that the greatest mistakes have been made in consequence of the ignorance of the teaching of the Church. Many dissenters are much opposed to the Book of Common Prayer, but this opposition arises entirely from ignorance and prejudice, and when once the scales fall from their eyes, then are they ready to acknowledge the sublime beauty of the Prayers. Yet the tide is setting in in favour of a Liturgy, because men of intellect and culture are tired of the vapid utterances and common-place truisms, which must of necessity find their way into so-called *extempore* prayers.

It is a most valuable book to be placed in the hands of Sunday School teachers, and those who have the care of the young. And with the craze for Church Reform, shortened services, and the like, we are afraid that there is a danger that some of our Church-going people never hear some of the prayers. More especially must we condemn the growing practice of relegating the Litany to the afternoon, for the benefit of children and servants, a position which it was never intended to fill; and among the extreme High Church party of getting over the Morning Prayer as fast as possible, to make way for what is known as the "High Celebration." We confidently recommend this volume for the careful perusal of churchmen as one of the attempts to illustrate and show the beauties contained in our Book of Common Prayer.

"HEALING BY FAITH: OR, PRIMITIVE MIND-CURE." By W. F. Evans, Author of "Celestial Dawn." (London: Reeves and Turner.) 1885. Pp. 214.

THERE are many new theories in the world, and one of the latest is that of those who are ready to discard and set aside the teaching of ages, in order to set up some fancied theory of their own. The author of the work before us endeavours to show that all the diseases in the world can be treated by faith; but whatever we may be told on this subject, we can only point to results, because if so, then our hospitals and infirmaries are useless, and instead of appointing medical practitioners we must formulate a scheme with a large army of apostles to go forth and proclaim this new doctrine, a result which is manifestly absurd on the very face of it, for while we are ready to admit that the use of "faith" is necessary in the administration of medicine and of surgical operations, and that God's blessing may be invoked, yet we must use all the means in our power for the recovery of that which is the highest blessing the Almighty can bestow—the blessing of health.

The first chapter deals with the question "What are ideas? and what is idealism" and abounds with extracts from Plato, and references to the Kabala. And then, in the next chapter we are told that—

> The philosophy of idealism is to be applied to the cure of disease, as it was by Jesus Christ. All disease, so far as it has a material or bodily expression, must have had a pre-existence in us as a fixed mode of thought, that is, as an idea. To expunge from the mind and obliterate from our soul-life the idea of it, is to remove the cause of it, and hence to cure the malady.

This may be all very well in theory, or "idealism," but if the author will only take the trouble to visit the homes of the poor he will find that disease *does* exist, and to say that we are to *expunge the idea of it* would seem only a mockery. Take the case of the patient suffering from cancer or consumption—is that only in the mind? Would to God that it were so! But such statements will not bear the light of reason,

for it is only a delusion and a snare, and, say what we will, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that disease does exist, and requires something more tangible than the so-called "Healing by Faith."

Farther on we have given to us a definition of faith. Thus :—

We already have faith, and are perpetually acting under its influence and guidance, but have not learned its higher application and uses. Faith is only that intuitive intellectual perception that lies above the range of the sensuous plane of the mind's action, and which we call into exercise every time we correct the illusion of our senses, and judge and act contrary to their deceptive appearances, whenever we judge not according to appearance, but judge righteously, or according to divine rectitude of thought we exercise faith.

The third chapter deals with "The Triune Constitution of Man, and the Discovery of the Real Self," and in it we find the following words :—

When we discover our *real self* we find at the same time God, and health, and heaven.

A statement which needs something more to qualify it for general acceptance. So again, speaking of the *pneuma*, we read :—

The *pneuma*, or spirit, is the supreme degree of the mind or thinking principle—the dome of the temple of God in man, where our being rises into the immeasureable heaven. The *pneuma* of Jesus and Paul is the inmost degree of the mind, the angelic and divine man, the immortal and real self.

This opens out a wide subject, and one upon which much difference of opinion exists ; and while the author proves things according to his own ideas, or rather interprets certain portions of Holy Scripture so as to coincide with his own notions, yet we do not think that he will gain the attention of thinking men.

In the chapter on "The Saving Power of the Spirit of Man," and speaking on those words in the Book of Revelation, "Behold I stand at the door and knock," the author says :—

But it is not on the outside door of men's souls that He knocks for admittance, as if He were external to us. The Christ is already within us (*how* he does not explain), and He seeks to pass outward into the soul and its body, and permeate these with a higher life. He knocks on the inner door, that opens inwards towards God and the kingdom of the heavens, which, if we do not bar against His egress, He will open and pass outward, and become the Saviour (or healer) of the body, and of others through us. In praying to the Christ to save us, we are not merely to *invoke* the Christ, or call upon Him to come in, but to *evoke* the Christ, who is already in the hidden depths and centre of our being.

This is certainly, to say the least, a very peculiar and fanciful interpretation of Scripture, and one which will not commend itself to the great number of Biblical students. We have also very numerous quotations from the works of Swedenborg, and the author would seem in many things to have accepted his teaching ; but while we are ready to admit that something may be learned from Swedenborg's works, yet his teaching is not accepted by the great body of professedly Christian men.

The author has evidently taken great pains to place his subject in a favourable light, and must have spent a considerable amount of time in the preparation of his work, and when we are confronted with the doings of the "Peculiar People," the wild vagaries of the Salvation Army, and Roman Catholic pilgrimages to Lourdes for the cure of diseases, and the theories of faith healers, we seem to see the fulfilment of the proverb that "extremes meet." It is well for us to read and see what their peculiar tenets are, so that we may be able to meet them on their own ground. There is quite enough ignornnce and superstition in the world, and therefore it behoves us to stand in the old paths and walk therein, and yet not to blindly shut our eyes to the teachings and practices of others.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Attridge, Rev. J., B.A., Senior Curate of Eccles Parish Church; Chaplain to the Bishop of Christ Church, New Zealand.
Barnes-Lawrence, Rev. A. L., Vicar of Aberford, Yorkshire.
Erskine, Rev. W. R., Curate of Alvechurch, Worcestershire ; Vicar of Treleigh.
Fisher, Rev. A. T., Rector of Skelton, near York.
Foxley, Rev. Joseph, Rector of Carlton-in-Lindrick.
Lewis, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Rector of Fonthill Gifford.
Nixon, Rev. Thomas William, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Winchester.
Noyes, Rev. Frederick Robert Halsey Herbert, D.D., Rector of Long Crichel with Moor Crichel.
Pincott, Rev. E. L,, Vicar of Brenckburn ; Vicar of Bolam.
Rees-Mogg, Rev. Henry James, M.A., Rector of Mixbury, Oxon.
Selwyn, Rev. Sydney Augustus, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Hatcham.
Shelford, Rev. L. E., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Clapton ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, Stoke Newington.
Stafford, Rev. John Richard Wykeham, M.A., Vicar of Whitchurch, Canonicorum, with the adjacent Chapelries of Stanton St. Gabriel, Chideock, and Marshwood, Dorset.
Thomas, Rev. David, M.A., Vicar of Walditch.
Thomas, Rev. P. E., Curate of St. Paul's, Blackburn ; Incumbent of St. Barnabas', Blackburn.
Turner, Rev. Herbert William, M.A., Rector of Sutton.
Walker, Rev. T., Curate of Pimperne ; Rector of Charlton Marshall, Dorset.
Wordsworth, Rev. Christopher, Rector of Glaston ; Prebendary of Liddingtou, in Lincoln Cathedral.
Wyld, Rev. F. A. Alban, Vicar of Barkingside, Essex ; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Romford.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cradock, Rev. Edward Hartopp, D.D., Principal of Brasenose College, at Oxford, on the 27th ult., aged 75.
Crossley, Rev. Thomas, M.A., her Majesty's Chaplain at Hampton Court Palace, at Folkestone, on the 24th ult., aged 59.
Curtis, Rev. Francis Henry, M.A., at 4, Beauchamp Square, Leamington, on the 29th ult., aged 57.
Ffoulkes, Rev. Henry Powell, Archdeacon of Montgomery, and Rector of Whittington, Salop, at the Canonry, St. Asaph, on the 26th ult., aged 71.
Greer, Rev. Samuel, Precentor of Clogher, Rector of Enniskillen, and Rural Dean, at Chanter Hill, Enniskillen, on the 31st ult., aged 85.
Howard, Rev. William, fifty years Vicar of Great Witchingham, at the Vicarage, Great Witchingham, in the county of Norfolk, on the 26th ult., aged 82.
Matthew, Rev. John, Rector of Chelvey, at 9, Codrington Place, Brighton, on the 28th inst., aged 86.
Owen, Rev. W. Hicks, M.A., Senior Vicar of St. Asaph Cathedral, and Vicar of Tremeirchion, son of the late E. Owen, Esq., of Garthyngharad, Merioneth, at Rhyllon, St. Asaph, on the 20th ult., aged 85.
Page, Rev. James Robert, at 1, Hobury Street, Chelsea, on the 25th ult., aged 79.
Sandon, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Stanford-on-Avon, at Lindum Terrace, Lincoln, on the 25th ult., aged 41.
Smith, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Long Stanton, at All Saints' Vicarage, Long Stanton, Cambs, on the 23rd ult., aged 75.
Sugden, Hon. and Rev. Frank, at Eversfield Place, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 17th ult., aged 68.
Welch, Rev. Dr., Rector of Barnoldby-le-Beck, Grimsby, and late Head Master of King Edward's Grammar School, Stourbridge, on the 22nd ult., aged 58.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## RELIGION AND REVELATION.

By the Rev. J. M. WILSON, M.A., Head-Master of Clifton College.

Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral.

"And they took him, and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?"—Acts xvii. 19.

THIS scene suggests a comparison of Christianity with the old world religions. It might be the text for a sermon on comparative religion; but I do not intend to preach such a sermon, but rather to invite your attention to this phrase—"comparative religion," with which most of us are now very familiar. It is a somewhat modern phrase, and it has begun to exercise great influence over the thought of our time. Books are written on the great religions of the world, Christianity being, of course, mentioned as one of them; and, though in such books it is always pointed out that Christianity is the highest and the purest, yet the mere fact of classifying Christianity with other religions leaves inevitably the impression, so far as it goes, that Christianity is, like the others, a local, temporary religion—a mere passing stage in the religious evolution of man. It is, therefore, an extremely important phrase and conception, and one that is worth thoroughly examining.

What is religion? I will not give you the various definitions that have been given of religion by philosophers, because their definitions concern its idea rather than its expression, and, therefore, do not throw much light on its comparative study; but the expression of religion consists of a cultus and a dogma, and hence comparative religion, which deals with the expression of religion, consists in tracing the history and development of *cultus* and dogma in the different ages and races of the world. It is the history of forms of worship and of speculative opinions on the relations of man to unseen powers. That is the sphere of comparative religion; and, in this historical survey, Christianity, in so far as it consists of a cultus and a dogma, must of course be included.

*In so far as it consists of a cultus and a dogma;* but the important question is, whether this would not be a very superficial view of Christianity; whether, indeed, the historical development of Christianity in *cultus* and in dogma does not conceal more than it reveals of the true nature of the work of Christ; whether, in fact, *cultus* and dogma, with which comparative religion deals, and with which alone it deals, are not accidents, and something very different from the essence of Christianity.

The fact is that unless we watch our thoughts very closely we are apt to ignore a most fundamental characteristic of Christianity, and the phrase "comparative religion" has tended, along with other causes, to obscure this characteristic. Christianity is essentially a revelation, not a religion, and the difference is enormous. Religion, to use the word in its more precise and limited sense, religion—that is, *cultus* and dogma—is the expression of a universal human instinct; revelation is some transmuting, transforming influence in us and on us which is usually antagonistic to this instinct. Religion is a subject of history; *cultus* and dogma are born and grow and perish; revelation is spiritual, accumulative, imperishable. This was one of the truths of which the world caught a glimpse at the Reformation, and now a far clearer view is dawning on the world. We have to disentangle our thoughts on this contrast of religion and revelation before we can readily understand the limited sphere of comparative religion. Endless confusions cluster round these two words, religion and revelation.

The origin of religion is to be sought for deep in the instincts and circumstances of human nature. All races, savage and civilised, show these instincts. Much has been made, and truly made, of the witness they bear to the spiritual powers of the world; but we are still more familiar in history with other manifestations of these powerful instincts in fear, in superstition, in fatalism, in cruelty, in lust, in persecution, in priestcraft, and in hostility to all science and light. The history of religion is a dark and terrible history; but with this instinct of religion some force, some illumination, has plainly ever been contending. This force, this illumination, is revelation. It seems a strange and startling assertion, but is it not the fact?

It may throw a fresh light on the study of the Bible if you look at it with this thought of the contrast and contest between religion and revelation. The Old Testament is not a record of the Divine origin and establishment and sanctions of a religion. To represent it as this is to lose sight of its most instructive aspect. The Jewish nation, when they first appeared in the dawn of history, already were possessed of strong religious traditions and instincts, inherited from their less enlightened, far-off ancestry, and modified by the peoples with whom they had been brought in contact. Ritual and sacrifice and fixed beliefs were not unfamiliar with them. Some of those traditions were by no means of a high order. Through their long history, so far as it is known to us, from Moses to Ezra, may be traced the two contending forces—

one the religious instinct, which was always turning them to externals, the other the antagonistic voice that ceaselessly strove with man; that spoke in Moses and made the two great commandments of the law—love to God and man—stand out above all else; that spoke in Samuel and taught the nation that "to obey was better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams"; that spoke in David and in the prophets, again and again, in words too familiar to need quotation, and thus made, as Matthew Arnold has expressed it, the word "righteousness" the keynote of the Old Testament. Finally, we see this voice almost silenced in the age of Ezra. It was the age of revival of religion, and simultaneously the prophetic voices died out: the voice of the priest was embodied in ritual, the voice of the prophet was hushed, and the nation committed itself finally to religious conservatism. And then the Old Testament closes.

You will understand then what is meant by saying that the Old Testament is not the record of a religion; it is a record of a contest between the less enlightened religious instincts of the Jews, and what for the present we may call the revelation of God made through the hearts and voices of men. Here lies the unending value of the Books; and the record terminates when the contest terminates — when religion was stereotyped and revelation hushed; the natural growth of thought and revelation was strangled by the grasp of religion. Then, after four centuries, not indeed of blank, but of quiet preparation in many forms, in the fulness of time Christ came. And what did He come to do? To found a new religion—the Christian religion? Surely not. He came to renew and to continue the long-lost revelation; He came not to "destroy but to fulfil." He came as one of the prophets, though far greater than any prophet, and He came as the great revealer of God—we Christians think Him to have been the unique revealer of God. And so the contest was renewed once more—renewed more cruelly than ever. He was treated as a blasphemer, and was put to death by the religionists of the day. As they treated the prophets—killing some and stoning some—so at the last they treated Him. It is the consummation of the contest between religion and revelation. That contest has been seen, and will be seen, in other lands, in other ages; but the cry "Crucify Him, crucify Him" is the climax, the acme of the ceaseless contest between the lower religious instincts of the human race and the higher Divine light that pours on men, even though they know it not, from the unseen spiritual power of the world. Christ was in no sense the founder of a religion, of a new cultus and dogma. His whole life, rightly read, is a force contending against the predominance of religion in this limited sense of the word. He abolished ritual of time and of place, He broke down all barriers of race and caste and calling. Simple as was the dogma of the Jews, He introduced no new dogma; He brought them straight into God's presence, and that quickened all their spiritual instincts and life. Obedience to the will of God, purity, gentleness, sympathy with all, with the simple and the suffering, the heart open to receive the truth and light and love of God—these, and such as these, were the lessons taught by His love. They consummated and sanctioned the purest teaching of the prophets. This was His religion. But He was more than this. He was the revealer of God in the only way in which we can imagine God revealed to man—His revelation was Himself—a man in close and vital union with God. He came as a light into the world to guide and purify the thoughts of men about God. This is plainly the teaching to be gathered from the gospels as a whole, and is the key to His life and words. And this is wholly unconnected with any idea of establishing a new religion.

So, too, when we read the gospels, it is plain that the writers had not formed any idea that they were founding what we commonly mean by the Christian religion. Their simple memoirs were not written with the thought of their becoming the text-book of a new religion. It is as a revelation embodied in life and facts and conversation and anecdote and prayer and parable and discourse, not as a *cultus* and dogma, not as a finished ritual or a speculative creed, that the work of Christ presented itself to the writers of the gospels. And, again, it was not as a religion that it was preached. The extreme simplicity of the earliest creed—"the word of faith, which we preach," as St. Paul calls it—has often been remarked on. The only rubric of ritual in the New Testament is equally simple—"Let all things be done decently and in order." It was certainly not in creed or ritual that Christianity found its power at first; it was in the dissolution of creed and ritual, and in the revelation of new light on the mysteries of the life of man. New hopes, new bonds, new purposes, new consolations, a new ideal of life arising from the revelation of God in Christ, and the resurrection of Christ from the dead,—Jesus and the resurrection, and the new light that shone from these facts—these were the subjects of the early apostolic preaching. And, once more, the Jews would not hear. They were religionists, and they closed their eyes to the revelation God was making, because it came in a form they did not expect. "They preferred," as Kant had said, "the service of religion to the service of God." "The light shone in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not." And thus the revelation of God in Christ was preached to nations that had gone through very different disciplines, and the seed fell on very different soils. But one experience that is met with was universal; it found everywhere the religious instinct developed. Even the Athenians, who had little enough of *cultus* or

dogma, were found by St. Paul to be somewhat too religious; and, therefore, everywhere the old contest was renewed between revelation and religion. The records of ecclesiastical history are the records of the contest between the higher light and the lower instinct in the post-Christian centuries, just as the Old Testament is the record of a similar contest in the præ-Christian centuries. In that contest the higher voice has never been wanting. Voices have always been found to proclaim that God prefers mercy to sacrifice, even though men knew not, and still "know not, what that meaneth." Rays of Christ's light have always penetrated the darkness and made it visible; they show at this moment how dark our own age is. "The light still shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not." For the religious instinct is deep in human nature, and at times it would seem as if it smothered the revelation of Christ.

Thus it comes to pass that what appears on the face of history as the Christian religion—viz., its *cultus* and dogma, some of its external manifestations, most of what we popularly mean by the Church system—all this is the expression of the old hereditary religious instincts of man agglomerated from many sources, from east to west, from Teuton and Latin, partially, and only partially, transformed and illumined by the revelation of God in Christ, and is not the revelation itself. It is the dough which the leaven is transmuting rather than the leaven, the transmuting force.

Now you may begin to see in what sense Christianity may be introduced on a work of comparative religion, and in what sense it may not, and derive full advantage from the study of comparative religion. Nothing is more instructive than to see how the universal human instincts, bad and good, have exhibited themselves in various ages and countries, and are still to be seen among Christians; for to see them in other religions is to recognise their true origin. To study elsewhere superstitions, and the materialistic use of ceremonies or of sacred books; to study sacerdotalism and sectarianism, legends of magical powers, hatred of new light; to study these, I say, in the history of other religions, is to know that when we meet with similar phenomena among the records of Jewish or Christian nations we may be dealing, not with the essence of Christianity, but with the instincts of human nature, which are not only not peculiarly developed under Christianity, but are in the highest degree opposed by its spirit. We learn to see things in their true origin, and to call them by their true names. The study of comparative religion must, therefore, be a source of much light; and light is pre-eminently what we need in this age of confusion.

But, on the other hand, if we think that comparative religion deals with the whole of Christianity, deals with its power and its spirit as well as with its form and its abuses, we shall make a great and momentous error. Religion is multiform, transient, external; revelation is one, and progressive, and spiritual. Christianity must be regarded as essentially a power, a revelation, and only as accidentally connected with certain religious forms and dogmas. The Christian religion is the most mutable of all things, as has been said by Rothe, but Christian revelation is the most indestructible—it is light, it is life, it is growth, it is Πνεῦμα—it is spirit.

And now you may say, "Religion, the form and dogma, I understand; but what is revelation? Can there be a revelation that is not expressed in form or dogma? Can I conceive of it apart? Is it not a pure abstraction, like life apart from a living organism?"

It is difficult to answer this question at all, much more to answer it at the end of a sermon already long enough. The word "revelation" implies a theory, and it is a way of grouping facts. The facts are the history of man, the development continuous and discontinuous, of the spiritual insight and forces of mankind. These facts are what they are, and we may hope to arrive at some knowledge of them; but we need theories to group facts, and the theory which is expressed by the word "revelation" is this: that man is in his present condition a partaker in some inchoate manner of that controlling, universal consciousness which we call God, which illuminates the mind and conscience of man; that man is or possesses a φανέρωσις—a manifestation of God. The control exercised by this universal consciousness is exhibited in its effects, and one of the effects is the moral education and evolution of man. The growth and development of this manifestation of God in man and by man and to man is revelation. To those who grasp this God-theory, this revelation-theory, it carries absolute conviction. They read and see the history of man in this light—they see the Spirit striving with man, the eternal consciousness more and more revealed in the inchoate, time-bound individual. All the world of nature and of history speaks to them of God. It is a theory which man cannot perfectly master nor apply to every detail, nor prove conclusively to all minds; but, in spite of this, it convinces such as grasp it. Discovery becomes undistinguishable from revelations. All is the work of God.

Revelation, then, as I have used the word in contrast with religion, is that direct influence of God on the souls of men which teaches them, by way of discovery, truth in morals and in knowledge of God. It has acted, in part, through men whom we rightly call inspired. Its history is, in part, contained in books which, for the same reason, we rightly call inspired; and this revelation was consummated (though, as He Himself has taught us, it was not completed) in Christ, that Divine presence among men.

And now, if I have not quite exhausted your patience, there may be time to draw two or three important inferences from this contrast between religion and revelation.

First, as to the position of ourselves, the clergy. We have a twofold duty. We are at once ministers of religion and heralds of revelation, and our special difficulty, one which most of our clergy keenly feel—the difficulty of being perfectly honest and consistent—arises when these duties seem to conflict. As ministers of religion, we have to take the world as we find it, including the strong religious instinct. There is much, very much, in this instinct that is noble and good, and that leads men upwards, as well as something that is bad, that degrades and darken's men's minds; it is not the vocation of the clergy to alter a world of traditions and hereditary feelings of untold centuries; and religion, that is, *cultus* and dogma, is one of the appointed means, we cannot doubt, of educating the world. External forms and authoritative teaching are absolutely necessary, as even Comte discovered, and we can scarcely look forward to a time when they will not be necessary on earth. It is only in heaven that there will be "no temple"; on earth the sacraments and the reverent ritual, the assembling of ourselves together, the forms and order of a church, its creeds, and its articles, are, in their degree, necessary, though mutable. They are not only the channel through which revelation is transmitted; they are essential to its permanence. But, on the other hand, just as our bodies change yet our personality continues, so it is with religion. Our Church might be disestablished; views on episcopacy, liturgies, sacrament, the Bible itself, as different from ours as are ours from St. Paul's, may some day prevail, but the Christian revelation, remains undimmed as the light of the world, and therefore we must never forget that we clergy are more than ministers of religion—we are the heralds and evangelists of the Christian revelation. We have, therefore, to do in our small degree what Christ did—contend on proper occasions with the lower religious instinct and transmute it by the light of revelation. We ought not always to give way to the lower tastes of those who, with the tenacity of timidity, would make their Christianity consist of ritual and dogma alone, or even give such persons and such tastes a very high importance. We must regard their tastes as the mark of the uninstructed, the emotional, the lower nature. We must do so with wisdom, however, depreciating these things only as ends, but valuing them as means. It is the Christian life, charity, purity, justice, forgiveness; it is the consciousness and love of God as our Father, and our brotherhood with all men, and the varied duties that arise from this brotherhood; it is the light that the fact of the resurrection of Christ throws on the great problems that agitate all men—the meaning of life, and humanity, and our hopes as individuals; it is these—the sanction of duty and the illumination of life, and not *cultus* and dogma—that, if we would be followers of the prophets and of Christ, we should place in the first rank. As ministers of religion, we must give its due place to religion; but we are ministers of revelation also; and with the Bible, and with ecclesiastical history before our eyes, teaching on every page how ministers of religion have opposed and darkened the revelation that came through the prophets and Christ, we shall see the special danger of our calling, and be on our guard against it.

Secondly, this view of revelation and religion will enable us to understand men who have abandoned our dogma, and are indifferent to our *cultus*. It is, perhaps, our fault if they think that this is all that Christianity has to offer. They do not, and cannot escape from the Christian revelation, even though they call it by another name. The Christian revelation is light, and in that light some of them live, and walk, and the *cultus*, the ritual, the θρησκεία, which they adopt may not be wholly dissimilar to that pure cultus, ritual, and θρησκεία of St. James, which consists in charity, and purity, and unworldliness, and is, along with the Sacraments, the only Christian ritual ordained in the Bible.

Time does not permit me to make any further remarks, or I should have liked to show how the mastery of this contrast enables us to act and think on many religious questions with clear principles in these difficult days; how it enlarges our conception of revelation, of that voice of God that has spoken, and still speaks to man "at sundry times and in divers manners"; how consistently and honestly we can value and teach *cultus* and dogma when we grasp these broad principles; and with what tenfold weight come to us the great revealed truths, now the heritage of the human race—the laws of purity, honour, charity, love, self-sacrifice, brotherhood, the example of our Master, the presence of the Holy Spirit, our communion in Christ as a Catholic Church, and the hope of eternal life; and, lastly, I should have liked to show what a light is thrown on that wearisome question, the relation of science to religion. "Are they opposed?" men are continually asking. Unquestionably they are; but revelation and science are not opposed. But for all this there is no time now.

To conclude, then. In treating of comparative religion, we must not be misled when we treat Christianity as one of the great religions of the world; we now know what we mean. We mean that the revelation of God was universal, but was pre-eminently seen in the Jewish nation, among whom, according to the flesh, Christ came; that the revelation of God made in Him was, so far as we know, final, supplemented only by the continuous educating influence of His Holy Spirit on man, but that in the nations which have most fully

adopted the Christian revelation there has developed a *cultus* and a dogma—in other words, a religion—derived by no means exclusively from revelation, but in large measure from sources which it is the function of history to trace and of philosophy to examine, and that these form the mutable dress of the immutable and ever-accumulating revelations of God. What a guide, my friends, is there here to our conduct and our thoughts! What hope! What inspiration! The pages of history open themselves to our guidance! Had you lived in the days of the prophets, had you lived in the days of Christ, had you lived in the days of St. Paul or of the reformation, had you lived in any great age when new light streamed on the world, would you not long with a consuming desire to have been among the few who opened eyes and hearts to that light, and bravely sided with the few against the many, with light, and charity, and revelation, and God against darkness, and cruelty, and obscurantism, and human passion, even though they took the sacred name of religion? Would not you have longed for this with a consuming desire? Then remember that the struggle is incessant and is as clear now as ever it was. Remember that it *is* a great age in which you are living, and try to contribute to its greatness. We are called on by all the voices of past, by the solemn duties we owe to the future, to conquer our lower selves, to subdue the child that is within us, that craves for the external and the positive; and live, as Christ bids us, in the Spirit, not entangling ourselves again in the yoke of bondage. "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free," for that is the good news of the Gospel of Christ.

THE *Rochester Diocesan Chronicle* states that Mr. A. Houghton, who had served for many years in the Admiralty, was ordained on St. Thomas's Day as the first permanent deacon in the diocese, and licensed to St. John's, Blackheath. Dr. Robert Griffiths, sometime curate of Christ Church, Lee, has formally renounced his orders under the Clerical Disabilities Act.

THE *Manchester Guardian* says that in anticipation, of some length of time elapsing before Bishop Moorhouse can be confirmed in his new see, the Archbishop of York, as Metropolitan of the Northern Province, has arranged for carrying out the first ordination for the present year fixed by the late Bishop Fraser—namely on Sunday, March 21. The Archbishop is likewise making arrangements for conducting several confirmations in the diocese arranged by Bishop Fraser at the last meeting of Rural Deans held at Bishop's Court. As Easter Day falls so extraordinarily late this year (April 25), it is anticipated Dr. Moorhouse will be in England by that time, and it is probable in that case that he will be enthroned in the Manchester Cathedral on the first festival following Easter this year—that of St. Philip and St. James, May 1. In any case, it is fully expected that Bishop Moorhouse will be able to take the second ordination in the year arranged by Bishop Fraser—*i.e.*, Trinity Sunday, June 20.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1886.

## BENEFITS OF LAY REPRESENTATION.

WE have been asked privately to specify some of the advantages of lay government in the Church. Much may be said for the present system of Church government, the very fact that it has been modelled and grown up as it were during centuries past is a *primâ facie* argument that it ought to continue to exist. Any reforms that may be suggested ought to be well considered in all their bearings on the clergy, as well as on the laity, before they are adopted. Rash innovations, and even substantial additions, when made to an old fabric like that of our Church, if they are not in conformity with the original scheme and outline of the institution are just as likely to promote as to stave off its destruction. The formation of Parochial Councils with statutory powers is a reform quite alien to the constitution of the Church, and would, we think, destroy the very best feature of the Establishment, viz., the perfect liberty of the teacher—a clergyman who dares only say what will please his congregation and his parish council is either a nullity or a misleader. Parochial councils would, we believe, quickly disestablish the clergyman, and probably absorb some of the functions of the bishop. The present system of Church Government is something like an absolute monarchy; it is legally vested in the parson and two churchwardens, one of whom is his nominee, so that the legal representative of parishioners is always in a minority of the executive. The reform we would suggest is to reduce this absolute to a limited monarchy, which can be effected without any Act of Parliament, if the clergy would allow the parishioners to elect both churchwardens, and if they and the bishops would concede to the churchwardens, a larger share of power and responsibility in the management of all the secular arrangements and funds of the Church. What the "deacons" are in the Nonconformist chapels, such in power and authority we would have the churchwardens become in our parish churches. They should be endowed with considerable powers and responsibilities, and should represent the whole parish or congregation

in ecclesiastical things—which is in itself no small honour and privilege. The office of churchwarden would thereby become more attractive, and probably be filled by men of higher mental calibre, and of better social position. The fabrics, the services and finances of our churches would, we doubt not, be greatly improved by this reform. The great benefit, however, which would accrue to the Church as a spiritual agency from thus making the parishioners, through their annually elected representatives, directly responsible for the management of the funds and all the ecclesiastical arrangements of the Church, except the teaching and the administration of the Sacraments, would be that we should enlist the affections and the activities of the laity in Church affairs. The Dissenters do this to a large extent, and we believe that they thereby improve their moral and spiritual condition. We have no faith in Boards, which are always virtually irresponsible, for discharging executive functions. We may safely assert that the individual responsibility of two well-known men for the execution of such matters is immeasurably greater. There is no doubt but that the bishops ought to be brought into much closer contact with the laity than they are at present; this could be easily effected by appointing laymen to the offices of archdeacon and, it may be, of rural dean. By this arrangement the bishop could give assistance to churchwardens, who in return could keep the bishop informed of the needs and desires of the laity.

There is a loud cry in the present restless age for more Church legislation, which we are disposed to deprecate, certainly there is a great deal of time spent with little or no result in Convocation. If it is thought desirable that the laity should assist at these academic discussions, there is no reason why the churchwardens should not send proctors to Convocation as the clergy do. No doubt the cry for lay representation is raised by many clerics, if not by laymen, for the purpose of preserving the establishment, but inasmuch as the Church has grown up side by side, and is so interwoven with the other estates of the realm, that its removal would destroy the stability of all the other three, it is the duty of all patriotic citizens, whether Nonconformists or Conformists, to endeavour to strengthen the position of the Church. This can only be done by making it more the Church of the people than it is at the present time. We must maintain, however, that it is highly inexpedient for high reasons of policy, for the State to initiate such a change as Disestablishment and Disendowment.

THE Rev. H. W. Phillott rector of Staunton-on-Wye, Hereford, and Mr. W. Layton Lowndes, 27, Marine-parade, Dover, have been elected representatives of the diocese of Hereford for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in accordance with By-law 13.

## SACRIFICE.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE NEWRY CLERICAL ASSOCIATION, ON FEBRUARY 1, 1886.

BY REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., VICAR OF WARRENPOINT.

WHENCE came the idea of Sacrifice? From above or from beneath? From God, or from the dim, mysterious cravings of man's nature for some link to bind it to God? Man cannot help being religious; he finds himself in a world full of mystery, suffering, sin, death: forms terrible and ghastly, yet most real, round about him. Whence came I? Whither am I going? What is my life? What relation do I bear to the Power that is above me, around me, and from whom I derive my being? Does He care for me? Does the cry wrung from me in agony enter into His ears, or is it lost and wasted in the air? Man cannot help asking such questions. He cannot help believing that the Universe has a Ruler. He would fain believe that Ruler to be his Father, but he cannot escape from the evidences of his being by nature in a state of rebellion and hostility to the Moral Governor of the Universe. How to appease God! How to find some connecting link between his own soul and that spiritual world which surrounds him? This question has engaged Man's attention ever since the birth of human thought. The idea that man has offended Deity and must propitiate Him is universal. Was sacrifice the result of this idea? Was it the result of direct revelation? One thing we may lay down as a fact which cannot be controverted, that the theory of sacrifice as a means of propitiating God, apart from repentance, did not take its origin from mere human reason. It is most unreasonable. There is not the slightest connection between Man and his victim—between moral evil in the worshipper and physical suffering in the victim offered. On the contrary, the whole system is opposed to our ideas of benevolence. We cannot conceive why a just and holy God should find delight in the slaughter of His creatures. We have no positive evidence in Revelation that Sacrifice was divinely instituted, but we have evidence that on the first recorded occasion in which blood shedding entered into the rite the Divine approbation was vouchsafed to the worshipper.

The sacrifice offered by Cain and Abel is of considerable importance in enabling us to arrive at a just conception on the subject. There was no prescriptive right, no long established custom, no prejudice, no argument from reason or example, such as is pretended in the case of Israel. To Abel, a shepherd, it must have been most abhorrent to take the life of a lamb, and this abhorrence would be all the more certain because the permission to take animal life for food does not occur before the Flood. It is true the offering is called Minchah, but the special mention of the fat proves that the lamb was slain in sacrifice. As a shepherd Abel loved his flock and took delight in their gambols and in their innocent pursuits. Yet he slays one of his choice lambs as an offering to God. Why? It was unnatural, unreasonable, and we cannot conceive any act more unlikely to occur to Abel as acceptable to God. But if such an idea had entered his mind, if he had, unbidden, brought to God a life that was not his own, and sought by the blood of an inno-

cent victim to propitiate Deity, would the sacrifice have been accepted? Why did God receive the offering of Abel and reject that of Cain? To my mind it is quite clear that you cannot evade this difficulty. You cannot explain it away in any manner except on the supposition that there had been already given to Man a divine revelation teaching him to seek for the favour of God by shedding of blood. That the difference between Cain and Abel lay not in the mere external offering but in the motive that underlay the character of each is evident from the Epistle to the Hebrews, but it is equally manifest that the internal principle developed into the external action and thereby became acceptable to Deity. Thus Abraham was justified through faith, but the faith of the patriarch was a living principle which manifested its vitality by obedience. We have plain proof that God gave our first parents a revelation, and that He held frequent intercourse with them. Why, then, should we assume that in this one particular Natural Religion preceded Revealed Religion? "Abel must have worshipped God in vain had his sacrificing been merely a commendment of his father Adam or an invention of his own." * That the acceptance of Abel's offering would give a powerful *impetus* to the system of propitiatory sacrifice must have been known to God. That it would lead in the not distant future to the shedding of rivers of blood, to great cruelty, to superstition and endless suffering, all this was known to God, yet He deliberately rejected Cain's offering and as deliberately accepted the sacrifice of Abel. The Scriptural narrative also goes far to disprove the theory that sacrifice took its origin in the slavish fear entertained by Man towards God which led him to seek to avert His wrath by the gift of what he deemed his best and dearest possession. On the contrary, the relations between God and man are represented as being of a friendly nature, and even Cain is described as arguing his case with Jehovah. If, therefore, sacrifice cannot claim Divine institution, it certainly can claim Divine sanction, so that we are quite safe in concluding with Bishop Butler :—"Sacrifices of expiation were commanded of the Jews and obtained amongst most other nations from tradition, whose original probably was revelation."

I have dwelt on Abel's case at some length because then for the first time we meet with sacrifice, but we must also bear in mind that in the worship of Noah God was pleased with the burnt offering which, as in the instance we have been considering, involved the slaughter of the victim. The same holds good with regard to Abraham, but we have a remarkable illustration of the manner in which God regarded sacrifice in the Book of Job. Whatever date we ascribe to that book, whatever views we may hold as to its scope and authorship, we cannot but feel that it conveys a distinct and emphatic Divine sanction, for the use of sacrifice and this sanction is outside and independent of the sacrificial system of the Jewish Church. It is significant that between the Fall and the giving of the Law we meet no mention of any sacrifice, other than animal sacrifice, except that of Cain, which was rejected by God.

In the Patriarchal Dispensation the offerings partook largely of the nature of federal rites, but in Job's case we have distinct reference to the expiation of sin. This expiatory feature is prominently marked in the Jewish Ritual, which I need hardly remind you was drawn up under the actual direction of Jehovah—"For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." (Leviticus xvii 11.) No language could be more express than this. Here the Jews are taught that the penal effects of the sins of the people were transferred to the victim, and that as the victim suffered the death merited by the people, they were released from penalty. You cannot evade the difficulties connected with this question by saying that the Jewish sacrificial system was a concession to a people newly emancipated from Egypt and accustomed to heathen forms of worship, for sacrifice had received the Divine approval before this period. The Jewish sacrificial system is merely the development and perfection of principles already sanctioned, if not indeed enjoined by Jehovah.

In considering the legal sacrifices you will find that the Burnt Offering contains the radical idea of all sacrifice—the surrender of all to God. Here, too, you have the principle of expiation—"And he shall put his hand on the head of the burnt offering and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him." (Leviticus i. 4.)

The Meat Offering, like that of Cain, was merely a thank-offering—eucharistic—acknowledging that all men possess is the gift of God. In the Peace Offering, which was a bloody sacrifice—part was burnt—part was eaten by the priest, by the worshipper and his friends, signifying the union between all and the God with whom they were brought into relationship. In the Sin Offering, which now appears for the first time, the victim was brought by the offerer to the priest, by whom it was slain, and the blood sprinkled, after which the flesh was eaten by the priest as a solemn appropriation of the sins of the worshipper. "Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord?" (Leviticus x. 17.)

Three main ideas seem to have entered into and to have been symbolized by sacrifice: (1) Expiation; (2) Dedication; (3) Thanksgiving. Those three are expressed in the Jewish rites of the Sin Offering, the Peace Offering, and the Burnt Offering. To enter into a minute examination of those sacrifices would be outside the scope of the present paper; it only remains that we should briefly consider what was the object of the sacrificial system. If it be true that you can measure the depth of the fall by the line lowered to draw a man up; if it be true that you can estimate the virulence of a disease by the remedies employed for its cure, then what a terrible lesson have we here on the moral and spiritual condition of mankind! What vain yearnings after peace! What wild longings after intercourse with the spiritual world! How dread the anticipations of retribution! What horrible depths of selfishness and slavish superstition! Fierce restless tossings of an immortal spirit conscious of its destiny, but seeking too often to recover holiness, happiness, and heaven by carrying out suggestions from the pit. Rivers of blood—altars smoking with burnt offerings, mothers stilling with caresses the cries of the children, whose weeping would have annoyed the demon gods, but could not save them from being immolated. The son bleeding for the sin of the sire—Moloch appeased by the blood of hundreds of human victims—Solomon's temple

* Hallett on Heb. xi. 4.

dedicated by the slaughter of 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep! What does it all mean? What mysterious link is there between the Jewish ceremonial law and the cruel rites of the Pagan? View this question from the standpoint of human reason, or as the mere creation of man's selfish fear of an unknown spiritual world, and the sacrificial system is a riddle without a key. But viewed in the light of the Cross the mystery is no longer insoluble. Then you can see three great truths clearly marked out. (1) Man's need of expiation for sin; (2) The insufficiency of the sacrificial system; (3) Christ the true atonement, of which sacrifice was but the forerunner and type. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Hebrews ix.-13, 14). He is "the very Paschal Lamb, which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world; who by His death hath destroyed death, and by His rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life."

When the Pagan priests led to the altar a particoloured bull they are said to have covered the dark spots with chalk that the victim might seem to be white, but when God provided a substitute, the reality corresponded to the seeming. "Wherefore, when He cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast no pleasure: then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God." Hebrews x. 5, 6, 7. (Compare 1 Peter i. 18, 19; Ex. xii. 5; Article xv.; 2 Corinthians v. 21; Hebrews iv. 15; 1 John iii. 5, Hebrews ix. 14).

I cannot close this paper better than in the words of Newman—"Why Christ's death was requisite for our salvation and how it has obtained it will ever be a mystery in this life. But on the other hand the contemplation of our guilt is so growing and so overwhelming a misery as our eyes open on our real state that some strong act (so to call it) was necessary on God's part to counterbalance the tokens of His wrath which are around us, to calm and reassure us, and to be the ground and medium of our faith. It seems, indeed, as if, in a practical point of view, no mere promise was sufficient to undo the impression left on the imagination by the facts of Natural Religion, but in the death of His Son we have His DEED—His irreversible deed—making His forgiveness of sin and His reconciliation with our race no contingency, but an event of past history. He has vouchsafed to evidence His faithfulness and sincerity towards us (if we may dare so to speak) as we must show ours towards Him, not in word, but by action, which becomes therefore the pledge of His mercy and the plea on which we draw near to His presence, or, in the words of Scripture, 'Whereas all have sinned and come short of the glory of God,' Christ Jesus is 'set forth as a propitiation for the remission of sins that are past,' to declare and assure us that without departing from the just rule by which all men must in the main be tried, still He will pardon and justify 'him that believeth in Jesus.'"*

NOTE.—The objections to the Divine institution of sacrifice may be seen stated at length in "Magee on the Atonement," Appendix, No. 5.

* Newman, "Oxford University Sermons."

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### THE IRISH QUESTION.

SIR,—I do not wish to carry on any controversy with your rather arbitrary Irish "Subscriber" on the points he raises. He seems to hold that an Anglo-Norman family residing in Ireland for 400 years does not become Irish. It has been commonly maintained and believed that such families were apt to be more Irish than the Irish! I am grieved that any thoughtful man should wish to uphold the two-race theory pushed to such an extreme as to deny the existence of any Irish nationality, and refuse to allow the greatest of Irishmen to be ranked as Irish because they were, presumably, not of pure Milesian blood. Certain great qualities mark the Irishman, as such, remarkable, and even daring courage, moral and physical, ardent enthusiasm, strong affections, deep devotion, extreme quickness and liveliness of thought (fully half, perhaps more, of our leader writers are Irish), a faculty of generous wit, exemplified in Sheridan and his descendants, Grattan, Banim, and last, not least, that exceedingly clever Irish theologian (whether we agree with him or not), the Rev. Dr. Littledale, altogether a combination, and I may even say, a galaxy of powers and talents, whatever your correspondent may think, which makes one of the best known and most universally recognised of nationalities throughout the world.

We grant that Ireland's past has been unfortunate, that religious and political divisions tended to make two races or nations of the Irish population, and that the work of reconciliation is not an easy one.

I will further grant that my *reductio ad absurdum* of your correspondent's contention is not to be taken in the letter. Under more favourable auspices English races have amalgamated better than Irish, though problems still remain to be solved in England also, and Dutch William did not conquer England. But the attempt to keep alive the unhappy memory of an ancient conquest in Ireland provokes retort, in spite of your correspondent's suggestion that such pleasantries might be regarded as high treason! It is certain that Orange Protestantism has its noble memories and high qualities, but I must take leave to think that it is not wise to celebrate too ardently the memory of civil war in the past.

As for the declaration of this gentleman that local legislation is in any sense an impossibility, that centralisation must be maintained in its full force, that local chambers, Peers and Commons, in London, Edinburgh and Dublin, can by no possibility be allowed to dispose of purely local questions, leaving untouched the constitution and prerogatives of the Imperial Parliament, which would then sit for four months instead of six. I think the best answer will be the approaching legislative action in this very direction of our two Houses of Parliament and the Crown. I believe, seriously, that this is the only possible and practical solution of the existing difficulty or problem.

The all-important matter is, not to get rid of the Irish nobility and gentry, as, possibly, some English Radicals would wish, but rather to secure their position as the natural leaders of the people, as the

hereditary representatives of law, order, and private property. With these, in the Irish Upper Chamber, must sit representatives of the three great religious bodies, the Church of Ireland, as your correspondent rightly calls it, in my judgment, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Presbyterians of the North. In my opinion there should be at least as many Roman Catholic as "Protestant" representatives, perhaps more. What is essential is to prove to our Irish Roman Catholic fellow-subjects that in spite of the past, we are prepared to meet them on a footing of strict justice and equality. And here I may be permitted to say that such an enactment has been facilitated by the great wisdom and largeness of heart and mind displayed recently by the present reigning Pope, who has declared officially, in his Church's name, that henceforth all Christian States will do well to accept the principle of religious and political toleration! Not a tenth part enough has been said of this great advance on the part of the Church and Bishop of Rome, for which we are all bound to be deeply thankful to Divine Providence. In any case, every thoughtful man will see the necessity for conciliating the Churches in Ireland. In England and Wales and Scotland not only should all hereditary peers sit in the local Upper Chambers but it would also be very desirable to assign their due position there to the authoritative representatives of Presbyterianism, Roman Catholicism, Wesleyanism, etc. The hereditary principle must be our sheet anchor to give continuity and the sense of security, but all living interests should be represented, as far as may be, in the Upper Chambers of the respective countries.

I will not undertake to prove here that each country is perfectly able to attend to its immediate local interests; that far from promoting provincialism and narrowness, the legitimate gratification of natural instincts would involve a marked growth of loyalty towards the Empire and the Crown. The British Parliament could alone dispose of Imperial funds, or rule the Empire, and I am deeply persuaded that envy, jealousy, discontent, and disaffection, would all melt away, like shadows of the night, at the rising of the sun of this new system, which would ally a certain measure of self rule to confirmed Imperial unity.

Finally, I do not hesitate to say that this, in all its main essentials, is the only possible working solution of the existing difficulty, and is, in high probability, the "wise and safe measure" which the Ministers, who make their appeal to the constituencies, declare to be in course of preparation. If it is not, it certainly ought to be. Englishmen must extend their minds for once to a comprehensive remedy of a comprehensive evil, placing the three countries on a strict level and uniting them for many generations under the ægis of the Crown.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
February 6, 1886.

## CRITICISM.

SIR,—Everybody is familiar with the proverbial sayings:—"No case, abuse plaintiff's attorney;" "Drag a red herring across the scent." What is meant by them, namely, the raising of a false issue, is one of the most intrusive pests of critical discussion; and I am constrained to complain, that it has been intruded into the little controversy which has arisen between your reviewer and me. What I remonstrated against is, the use of a sneering tone in criticizing the Primate's views; the reviewer's answer is a challenge to prove that the Primate's views are right. Here a false issue has manifestly been raised. The reply has nothing to do with the original remonstrance. I purposely abstained from expressing any opinion about the Primate's views; it did not concern me, either to impugn or defend them. It was the mode in which they were attacked, that moved my indignation; it was against that I protested. The moral, not the intellectual, character of the criticism, was the thing that I wished to reprobate. The distinction is surely plain enough. Criticism need be none the less thorough and earnest for being urged in the tone and temper of Christian gentlemen; to think that it gains anything by exchanging that tone and temper for the opposite, is a mistake, none the less fatal, for being, unhappily, common.

But you may say, that by discussing the meaning of Acts xix. 2, adversely to the reviewer, I was defending the Primate's view of the Baptist's teaching. Not at all, I would reply. I was exposing the recklessness of that particular part of the attack on the Primate, by showing that it was based on an assumption, for which there is really nothing to be said. Having done that, indeed, I was led on by my interest in scriptural exegesis, to discuss the real meaning of the text in question; but which is the better of the two interpretations that I pointed out, does not concern the reviewer's position, nor am I aware which of them the Primate adopts.

Let me return for a moment to the text. You invite me to translate it without italics or supplementary words, and see if I can get any meaning but the reviewer's out of it. Well, if I do so, it certainly will not be his meaning at which I shall arrive. Literally, the text runs, "We did not even hear if Holy Spirit is,"—the emphasis lying on "hear," in antithesis to the question "Did ye *receive*?" The rendering adopted by the reviewer is, "We have never even heard if the Holy Spirit exists." To arrive at this two important alterations of the original text would be necessary. The first verb must be changed from the tense indicating a definite moment in the past, to one indicating the past indefinitely; and the word *not*, must be altered into *never*. So much for the literalness of the translation, which the reviewer puts forth as the express statement of Scripture.

I must further remark, that it is contrary to all sound principles of exegesis, to suppose that a word-for-word rendering can give the true force of an idiomatic phrase. Try it, in the very similar case of John vii. 39, where the literal translation gives as follows:—"This He spake of the Spirit, which believers on Him were to receive; for *not yet was* [*Holy*] *Spirit*, because Jesus was not yet glorified." Would even your reviewer be bold enough to affirm, on the authority of this verse, that Scripture expressly says that the Holy Spirit did not even exist before the Lord's ascension?

One word more. The twelve persons met by St. Paul at Ephesus were not only pious Jews who had received John's baptism; they had since become *Christian* disciples, and had believed in Jesus, although they had not yet received Christian baptism and the accompanying gifts of the Spirit. They appear to have been exactly in the same position as the

Apollos of the previous chapter, who "taught carefully the things concerning Jesus, knowing only the baptism of John." Is it within the limits of credibility, that neither in their Scriptures, nor their synagogues, nor from the lips of John, nor in their subsequent Christian fellowship, such persons had ever heard any mention whatever of the Holy Spirit?

PRESBYTER.

## THE DESTRUCTION OF THE HERD OF SWINE.

SIR,—Will "Presbyter" or some other clever correspondent give us his ideas on this incident, arising out of the healing of the demoniacs. It is described in yesterday's Gospel. Demoniacal possession could not be merely insanity or epilepsy, as the demons are represented as individuals who spoke to Christ. "Art thou come to torment us," etc.; "Suffer us to go away into the herd of swine." Would the destruction of the swine have any consequent effect on the demons in the way of punishment? How would you answer a sceptic who asserts that the destruction of the swine seems an act of cruelty to them, and of injustice to their owners?

M.

## "ROMAN DAYLIGHT."

SIR,—The following extraordinary passage occurs in Mr. Gurney's last letter in the PULPIT: "The Irish Anglican Church has had and has many graces and blessings, intellectual and spiritual, but to my mind it has tried to live by moonlight and starlight only. The Roman Church has had the daylight of sacramental worship." Sir, I find it hard to realise that a member of the Reformed Church should speak of a branch of that Church as having only moonlight and starlight, while the Roman, *i.e.*, the unreformed Church, has had daylight. If this be the case, the word Reformation is quite a misnomer, and retrogression, not progression, was the consequence of that great religious movement of the sixteenth century. If adoration of the Host and belief in purgatory are the chief elements of this superior Roman daylight, one feels inclined to say to Rome,—If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness. No one knows better than Mr. Gurney the painful excesses to which Mariolatry has been carried in the Roman Church; is this more of the "daylight" enjoyed in that Communion? And here I gladly quote Mr. Gurney himself. On one occasion when discussing religious subjects with a French lady, he said to her: "After all, the Christian's trust must be in his God and Father."

F. Lady.—"But I never pray to God the Father; He is too great."

Mr. G.—"Do you not say the 'Our Father'?"

F. Lady.—"Of course I do, habitually; but in my most heartfelt devotions I do not approach His awful and tremendous throne."

Mr. G.—"To whom, then, do you pray?"

F. Lady.—"I pray to God and His mother. I pray to God the Son, and to the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ; to God the Son not to condemn me, to His blessed mother to intercede for me."

"Such," says Mr. Gurney, "is the practical outcome of Roman Catholic piety in Spain, Italy, France, and Austria." Such also it is in Ireland, and I submit that Roman "daylight" must be judged by including this great practical element of her worship along with the adoration of the Host, etc., etc. Irish churchmen will be slow to exchange their "moonlight and starlight" for *such "daylight" as this;* and they can confidently appeal to the test of experience, as to which Church in Ireland is now "walking in the light" and bearing "the peaceable fruits of righteousness;" whether it is the Church, which nourishes the National League in its bosom, or the Church of the loyal minority.

COURTENAY MOORE, M.A., Canon.

## MR. A. GURNEY—ADORATION.

SIR,—May I ask Mr. Gurney what he meant by a sentence in his letter in in a recent issue? Speaking of prayers for the departed, he says, "It," the heart, "desires to follow its dear ones to another sphere, and the Church which refuses to gratify the instincts of intercession and adoration can never be popular." Does adoration here mean adoration of the departed? Adoration of God cannot be questionable.

2. In a contemporary Church paper for last week, I see an answer to Sacramental Adoration. "The answer seems to be that, as the physical constituents of the consecrated chalice are not chemically identical with blood, there is no conflict with the prohibition of the Jews against drinking blood." But Rome holds that there is present only blood, with the appearances of wine; and this paper tells us that we and Rome exactly agree.

AN IRISH CHURCHMAN.

## THE PRIMATE.

SIR,—The statement in your recent review of the Primate's Charge, that his Grace treats Evening Celebrations and Element Worship as co-equal errors, seems to me, if correct, very sad. Can you quote his words on the subject?

C.

[Physiologists teach us that an impression made on the brain at or just before bed-time, is more durable than one made at any other time of the day, and it is a fact that the Hebrew day began at sunset. We doubt, therefore, whether Dr. Benson's view can be historically accurate. The following is the passage from the Archbishop's charge:—"But I cannot hold that attending at the Eucharist without receiving it tends to increase Reverence. I can place this in no other category than that of Evening Communions. Both tend to familiarity along with diminishing responsibility. Both belong in their origin to weak ages of the Church. The one dates from times when the dreadful habits of half-converted hordes, which accepted the cross as a necessity or as a charm, made sincere Christian priests shrink from urging actual participation amid lives of unredeemed excess. The other belongs to the milder time which is timorous of urging the least touch of discipline, even if it be but the discipline of early rising, and which gives when the day is over that which should have consecrated the Lord's own day and the new week from His resurrection hour. Half the Christian Era is against the first indulgence; the whole of it is against the second. Further, I ask, can there be much doubt of the shape and turn which might at last be given to the Communion after Evensong, if it should become more general? It would

be the reversal of every aim of those who seek to bring it in. Its natural heir, if that other practice of Noncommunion also became general, would be the 'Benediction' Service, the element-worship of the Church of Rome."—ED.]

## IRELAND.

SIR,—As an Irish clergyman I feel indebted to Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Archer Gurney for their kind references to my Church and native land. One does not often meet a Broad-High-Churchman, which seems to be Mr. Gurney's school of thought. He seems to believe that inspiration was progressive in St. Paul's case, his later epistles being an improvement on the earlier; and to hold universalism, and a sort of doctrine of the Real Presence, which is not easily distinguishable from the Roman one. Has Mr. Gurney realised the moral breakdown of Romanism in Ireland, during the present crisis; when every branch of the league is presided over by a P. P. or C. C., and when a considerable portion of every Lord's day is devoted to League work, which implies dishonesty and disloyalty, and not unfrequently cruelty of the most frightful kind,

The Roman doctrine of the Real Presence, does not seem to make the people who believe in it, either honest or truthful; and, beyond producing a certain amount of external reverence, which, in many cases, easily degenerates into formalism, it seems to have little practical effect. AN IRISH PARSON.

## Reviews and Notices.

"THE MYSTERY OF GOD." By T. Vincent Tymms. (Elliot Stock.)

WE have a habit—perhaps a bad habit—of reading Prefaces (Mr. Tymms, by the way, calls his an Introduction), and when we found that this book was a series of lectures which the listeners had "requested the author to publish," we were dismayed. For much experience has taught us that apologies for publication are but weak attempts to shift the blame on to the shoulders of others; but there are exceptions to every rule, and Mr. Tymms' book is a noteworthy exception, for his book does not contain either a dull page, or a weak argument, or a spun-out and badly written sentence; and it is a model of courtesy and moderation towards opponents. We do not wish to pile up the adjectives, therefore we will only add that if any of our readers have friends troubled—*honestly* troubled, with difficulties, by all means let them send them to this book. A good popular answer to modern difficulties is always valuable, just as a weak one is always worse than none; we could name plenty of books which are well intentioned, and which for all that, we should never think of recommending, but we can most heartily recommend this, and we hope it will have a large circulation. Moreover the book is not merely a reply; part of it is, but only part. In this part the author deals with materialism, pantheism, and theism, giving, and giving most clearly, and with the fullest fairness to their exponents, the origin, the arguments, and the necessary conclusions of each. Or rather, it would be more correct to say, the one conclusion of all three, which is pessimism pure and simple. The materialist, the pantheist, and the theist, living as they do "without God in the world," are therefore "without hope," for there is nothing more unreal than the attempt of the Positivists and the Free-thinkers to work themselves up into a state of enthusiasm about "The Worship of Humanity," and "The Progress of the Species;" the spectacle would be comic if it were not too mournful. They come by different roads, it is true; the materialist comes by the road of the denial of all morality, for which there is no room in his system (for how can a machine deserve either praise or blame?); the Pantheist by the road that his hopes for the improvement of this world are but bare possibilities at best, and for the next (if it can be called a next) that he will be absorbed into the Infinite; and the Theist by the road that he has only the choice between a God powerless to prevent the evils of the world around, and therefore unfit to be worshipped, or else a God who, to quote Mr. Tymms, "has rigorously forborne to stretch forth the hand which made, and therefore could assist, mankind, in spite of all the cries and tears and agonising longings for his mercy which have filled the atmosphere of our globe from the beginning. Like those granite sphinxes which have looked down with changeless smile on the land of Egypt for forty centuries—while cities have been built and destroyed; while temples have risen and been filled with generations of troubled worshippers; while sepulchres have multiplied, and hot sands, blown from the desert, have covered ancient cornfields and broken monuments of perished glory—so the God of Deism, if that theory be true, has looked upon the earth while empires have risen and decayed, while false religions have grown, and priesthoods have thriven, and while deluded peoples have despoiled themselves of wealth, and shed the blood of enemies, friends and children on reeking altars, which attest the passion of their hearts for God."

We have left ourselves very little space to notice the second or constructive part of the book, which deals with the mode of God's revelation to man, with the Bible, the Person of Christ, the resurrection of Christ, and the Life of Faith. But we sincerely hope we have said enough to send our readers to the book itself. We have avoided using strong terms of praise, knowing that they engender suspicions of partizanship, and we will only add that when we spoke of the book as "popular," we did not mean that there is any "writing-down" in it, but simply that it does not assume its readers will know what as a matter of fact they very seldom do know, and that it does not bristle with quotations in Hebrew, Greek and Latin.

"THE MONTHLY INTERPRETER." February, 1886. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.)

THE six papers which make up the contents of this month's *Interpreter* are continuations, but we do not mean that the number is any the worse for that. Mr. Findlay continues his study of St. Paul's doctrine of the Church, and Professor Thomson continues his account of the anti-Christian systems of the nineteenth century with a paper on Pessimism—rather a thin paper. We cannot agree that "it is strange that the nineteenth century, which is the age of scientific discovery, of material triumphs, of man's mastery over nature—the age of political progress, of popular education, of philanthropy—should be the period of

pessimism." So long as the world had not these things, men hoped for them, and while there is hope there is no system of Pessimism; but now that men have got these things they have found out of how little real and permanent value they are; therefore Pessimism has naturally, not "strangely," sprung up. Prebendary Gibson writes sound sense on the groundwork of the Apocalypse; considering the awful nonsense generally written by way of "elucidation" of the Book—this alone is sufficient praise. Professor Bruce on "The Kingdom of God," Professor Milligan on "The Resurrection of the Dead," and "Professor Redford on Joel," are all good articles.

AT a special ordination on the 31st ult. Mr. Henry Jones Manley, St. David's Lampeter, was ordained deacon, by the Bishop of Bangor and licensed to Rhiw.

ON the 4th inst., the Rev. S. E. Lyon, curate of Stratton, presented, on behalf of the clergy of the deanery of Alresford, an address of farewell to Archdeacon Sumner (the Prolocutor-elect), who has vacated the office of Rural Dean on his appointment to the archdeaconry of Winchester.

CONTRARY to the usual practice of University preachers, the Bishop of Carlisle addresses especially the younger portion of his audience. It is unnecessary to say that the galleries are always full when he occupies the pulpit. On Sunday last, at Oxford, he preached on Companionship, at home, at school, and at college, taking as his text "My son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not." In his introductory remarks he made some interesting statements about the New Lectionary, and spoke of the value of the book of Proverbs, and the sapiential books of the Apocrypha.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adams, Rev. F. G., M.A., Curate of St. Mark's, Reigate; Incumbent of the New District of St. Barnabas', Gillingham, Kent.
Allen, Rev. Andrew J. Campbell, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Cherry Hinton; Principal of Chester Diocesan Training College.
Apperley, Rev. Josiah M., Vicar of Tonge, Kent.
Armstrong, Rev. Robert, B.A., Vicar of Newlands.
Bailey, Rev. T., B.A., Incumbent of Cardinal; Rector of Arnprior, Ontario, Canada.
Birbeck, Rev. B., Vicar of St. Augustine-the-Less, Bristol.
Blake, Rev. G. L., Chaplain to the *Sultan*.
Blathwayt, Rev. Charles Reginald, B.A., Vicar of West Ashby.
Clarkson, Rev. J. M., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Mons*.
Eaton, Rev. Walter, M.A., Rector of Hope Mansel, Herefordshire.
Fellows, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of South Reston.
Fenwick, Rev. George Bargate, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Felton.
Fletcher, Rev. John Joseph Knox, Rector of Brockley, Somersetshire; Vicar of Whittlebury, Towcester.
Furley, Rev. Henry, Rector of Kingsnorth, Kent.
Gibson, Rev. R. H., M.A., Rector of Loand, Suffolk, Rural Dean of Lothingland, and Domestic Chaplain to Lord Thurlow; Honorary Canon of Norwich Cathedral.
Hughes, Rev. William Henry, Public Preacher in the Diocese of Truro.
Jones, Rev. John Thomson, B.A., Curate of Llanfairfechan; Minor Canon of Bangor Cathedral.
Jones, Rev. Thomas Evan, Curate of Mold; Vicar of Carno, Montgomeryshire.
Lane, Rev. C. Arthur, Curate of St. Peter's, Cranley Gardens; Lecturer to the Church Defence Institution.
Lloyd, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Vicar Choral of St. Asaph Cathedral, and Curate of St. Asaph.
Luckock, Rev. Herbert Mortimer, D.D., Canon of Ely; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely.
Maclear, Rev. Dr., Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury; Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.
May, Rev. Frederick Granville, B.A., late Curate of Calstock; Rector of St. Mellion.
Morton, Rev. William, M.A., Succentor of St, Asaph Cathedral; Canon of Arthur Bulkeley in Asaph Cathedral.
Paget, Rev. Francis, D.D., Canon of Christ Church; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely.
Pegg, Rev. H. F., Vicar of St. Mary's, Birmingham.
Phillipps-Treby, Rev. Edward Mowbray, Rector of Minster; Rector of Forrabury, by dispensation.
Ricketts, Rev. B. W., Curate of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Hurst; Vicar of Christ Church, Denshaw, Saddleworth.
Sedgwick, Rev. John Edmund, M.A., Curate of Great Catworth; Principal of the Diocesan College, Rondebosch, Capetown, South Africa.
Sharpe, Rev. H. Edmund, M.A., Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of Whitchurch, Hants.
Shilcock, Rev. Willlam Alfred, B.A., Vicar of Barrow-with-Twyford, Derbyshire.
Sing, Rev. G. H., Fellow of Corpus Christi and Tutor of Selwyn, Cambridge; Rector of Stalbridge, Dorsetshire.
Smith, Rev. T. J., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Bedford Leigh; Vicar of Patcham, near Brighton,
Sparrow, Rev. J. J. H. S., Vicar of Willesborough; Rector of Tunstall, Kent.
Stanton, Rev. Vincent Henry, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely.
Street, Rev. Arthur Joseph, Vicar of Whittlebury, Towcester; Rector of Brockley, Somersetshire.
Taylor, Rev. Henry, Curate-in-Chargs of Capesthorne and Siddington, Cheshire; Rector of Heswall, Chester.
Templer, Rev. James Lethbridge, B.A., Rector of Burton Bradstock-cum-Shipton Gorge.
Thomas, Rev. J. W., M.A., Vicar of Rhos-y-Medre, Ruabon, North Wales.
Thorold, Rev. Algernon Charles Edward, M.A., Rector of Hougham with Marston.
Tucker, Rev. W. L., Chaplain to the *Hector*; Rector of Thorneyburn, Northumberland.
Whittington, Rev. R. T., Rector of Orsett; Honorary Canon of St. Albans Cathedral.
Wigram, Rev. W., Rector of St. Andrew's, Hertford; Honorary Canon of St. Albans Cathedral.
Williams, Rev. Cadwaladr, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Llanllugan.
Wilson, Rev. James, M.A., Chaplain to Carlisle Gaol.
Wood, Rev H. S., Chaplain to the *Hector*.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Baghot-De la Bere, Rev. John, J.P. for the county of Gloucester, and formerly, for many years, Vicar of Prestbury, at his residence, 15, Pittville Lawn, Cheltenham, on the 5th inst., aged 85.
Beadon, Rev. George Griffiths, late Vicar of Axbridge, at Crywcombe, Heathfield, on the 31st ult., aged 88.
Burgess, Rev. William Johnson, M.A., late Rector of Stretton Sugwas, Hereford, and formerly, for thirty-two years, Vicar of Lacey Green, Bucks, at Bromley Hurst, Epsom, on the 7th inst., aged 71.
Campbell, Rev. William Fraser, Vicar of Kintbury, at Euston Hotel, London, on the 29th ult., aged 43.
Smith, Rev. W., twenty-eight years Rector of Dry Drayton, and forty-three years Justice of the Peace for the county of Cambridge, at Greatham Moor, Petersfield, on the 4th inst., aged 73.
Story, Rev. Edwin, M.A., Cantab, F.G.S., etc., at Stoke Newington, on the 1st inst., aged 58.
Thomas, Rev, William Jones, M.A., for nearly twenty-seven years Vicar of Llanigon, J.P. for the counties of Hereford, Brecon, and Radnor, at Llanthomas, near Hay, on the 5th inst., aged 74.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## PATIENCE.

By the Most Rev. Dr. REICHEL, Bishop of Meath.

Sermon Preached in Dunboyne Church, on January 24th, 1886.

"Ye have need of patience."—Hebrews x. 36.

THE stress laid on Patience in the New Testament must, I think, strike even its most careless reader. In the Old Testament the word does not even once occur. In the New Testament it occurs one and thirty times, and always in a way which shows that the quality denoted by it is considered by the various writers as of extreme importance. The "Bringing forth fruit with patience," is, by our Lord, declared to be characteristic of those who receive the word of God in the good ground of an honest and good heart. "In your patience ye shall secure your souls," He predicts of those who undergo the tribulation of the last times victoriously. "Eternal life," according to St. Paul, is the portion of those who "seek glory and honour and incorruptibility, according to patience in well-doing." The result of tribulation used aright is patience, and patience in its turn produces experience, and experience hope, now the least cultivated of the Christian graces; whilst on the other hand, hope, if it be real, anticipating what we as yet see not, in its turn produces patience in waiting for its advent. The records of antiquity, the history of God's dealings with mankind, with His Church, and with individuals, is calculated especially to produce patience, says the same apostle, speaking of the right use of Scripture, and the God of consolation is also represented as the God of patience. "The signs of an apostle," writes St. Paul again to the Corinthians, "were wrought in his case before them in all patience." And in his later epistle to the Corinthians the same quality is again insisted on. The all-various power with which they were strengthened, according to the might of Christ's glory, was to issue "in all patience and long suffering with joyfulness." And to the Thessalonians he had long before, almost at the beginning of his apostolate, recommended patience of hope, patience and faith, the patience of Christ. In the three pastoral epistles patience appears thrice, associated with faith, charity and meekness. In the Hebrews it is again recommended as in my text, and as a necessary qualification for the Christian race. In the epistle of St. James to patience, if cultivated, is ascribed a perfect work, and in the Revelation occurs the most remarkable utterance of all. For there patience is coupled with the very kingdom of the Lord of glory. "I, John, who am your brother and fellow-partaker in affliction and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ."

I pause here without citing several other passages in which this quality appears as the result of faith, and the unique accomplishment of the true Christian. Those that I have quoted must surely have impressed you with the feeling that patience is something beyond common in the Christian mental scheme; that it deserves far more attention than it generally gets.

Let me, then, try to carry out the recommendations of it with which the New Testament is fraught. Reflecting on it may, perhaps, do something to reconcile you with that singular state in which we find ourselves called to play a part, and the strangeness of which seems to me to become more and more conspicuous and startling the longer I live in it.

Patience. The word patience comes, like most of the finer expressions of our tongue, from a Latin root, which root means to suffer, to endure. Much the same is the sense of the Greek word for which patience is the nearest equivalent. It denotes the bearing a thing, endurance; suffering being only the secondary meaning. But as enduring and suffering are very generally connected, we cannot say that our patience really transcends the Greek endurance.

The first thought that occurs to me is that patience is a direct imitation, strange as it may seem, of a certain quality of God. I do not know whether it has ever struck any of you, how slow the operations of the Deity are, what patience they display! God, says St. Augustine, is patient because he is eternal. He can afford to wait. Look at the enormous time, which modern science more than hints, has elapsed since the inconceivable beginning. "In the beginning God made the heavens and the earth." But how? When matter was first called into existence, when those atoms were created of which all visible and sensible things consist, and which some of the greatest natural philosophers of this age, notably, Herschel and Clerk Maxwell, have said bear all the characteristics of manufactured articles; this matter was not at once, in a moment, put together in that solar and stellar universe, which seems to have no bounds in space. It appears to have been so diffused as only very gradually to coalesce into those suns and planets which we now see, and on one of the smallest of which we dwell. Millions and millions of years may have elapsed during this wonderful process. Astronomers tell us that our sun is almost decrepit with age in comparison with some distant stars. The life of our own planet, before it was fit to be inhabited, may have been a hundred millions of years.

What may be the antiquity of some of those stars which we see in space, numbers can really give us no idea of Here, then, is the patience of the Eternal; He waits for the inconceivably gradual unfolding of His vast designs; He is patient, because He is eternal. If patience, in this sense, be recommended to us, may it not be, because we share the eternity of God? Unlike Him, we have begun, but like Him we shall never end. And as with Creation, so again with Providence, in the affairs of man. How long has our race existed on this globe! By what slow and gradual steps has it been formed to that degree in which its more perfect specimens are found! How tedious the development from mere sensation to reflection, from *consciousness* to *conscience*, from mere knowledge of existence to knowledge of good and evil, from self-love to love of others and self-denial for their sakes! Look at the Old Testament; see in its pages the immitigable hatred burning in the heart even of a man like David, which asserts itself in his dying direction to Solomon not to let the grey hairs of his formerly rebellious subject go down to an unbloody grave; and contrast with this the last hour of Christ and of Christ's first martyr, invoking forgiveness on their murderers! What progress! but how slow!

So, too, with the fulness of the time at which the Saviour came. I have heard unbelievers adduce this as a serious difficulty. Why, if Christ's coming was so all-important, why did He not appear at once? Why was not the second Adam really the second Man upon the globe, instead of His being the tardy product of untold generations? But is that the way with God? Does He ripen man, the race, the individual, at once? Is there not infancy, childhood, youth, in the race as well as in the individual? And had the demand of these shallow persons been apparently complied with, might not a strong objection have been raised against Christianity on this very ground? What! would you have us believe, it would then have been said, that perfection—the Perfect Man—was the instant product of the first rude humanity which appeared upon the globe, having everything to make out and discover for itself, knowing nothing as yet of the civilising arts which are the slow growth of millenniums of hardship and experiment! The late appearance of the Perfect Man, of the Perfect Religion, is exactly in unison with the whole system of Nature, in which God is always working, is always evolving the higher out of the lower. Not but that the very perfection of our Christ is in itself the proof of His direct origin from God. For every principle of heredity, true elsewhere, is violated, not in the mere claims, but in the actual and unmistakable facts of the character of Christ. Such a Personage as He appears in the pages of the Gospels, was not merely beyond the creation of their writers, but beyond mere natural descent from man. Our Lord is a break—a new beginning in the series. A Man whom science will soon find herself called on to admit she cannot, on mere scientific principles, account for. If evolution and heredity be true, then is Christ God and Christianity divine.

Again, consider the patience of God in reference to another matter, the sinfulness as well as the imperfection of man. And this kind of patience, generally called long-suffering in the Bible, is a quality in which we are specially called to imitate Him, to be perfect as our Father in Heaven is perfect. When we are wrought up into indignation or fretted into impatience by the strange perversity, by the captiousness, the determined misbehaviour of the people we have to deal with, let us think of the long-suffering of God. I have heard that a notorious atheist challenged the Divine existence because God endured so patiently his vaunts and blasphemies. If He exists, let Him strike His adversary dead. "I give Him five minutes to do so," taking out his watch, and when the five minutes had elapsed, amidst the horrified silence of some, and the anxious expectation of others, he boasted that he had demonstrated there was no God! Fool! to think that God was altogether such an one as himself! That because he, perhaps, could not have brooked such an insult, therefore the Deity must needs be stung into instant action! Fool! not to recognise the long-suffering of God stamped on every page of history, on every moment of existence, on every development of the Universe, on every experience of the individual! In this, then, let us imitate God. Let us learn to wait for results which cannot, in the course of Providence, be had at once; to endure what we have to bear from our fellows as those who see Him that is invisible in this part of our probation also!

This endurance of the perversity of men—this long suffering, this longanimity rests on more than the mere recollection of the slowness of all great change. It rests also on the recollection of how many "changes and chances" befall men in this life, powerfully influencing not merely their outward lot, but their inward disposition.

The human character is a very gradual and a very complex growth. How different the man from the child; with many elements of sameness. Identity of persons continues; but there are vast changes due to mere advance in age. But besides this kind of change, which must take place, and within limits may even be predicted, there are changes due to circumstance, and these are quite incalculable.

No one can know what will befall him, and every event has its influence on the character. We may well, therefore, have patience with those whose future destiny we cannot foresee, and whose character may be altogether changed thereby; God can endure them, why not we? If we say

that with God there is no endurance, because He cannot suffer, I think this is dogmatising beyond our right. We cannot tell what or how God feels: but we are assured even by our own consciousness that, as He who made the eye must be able to see, so He who made us capable of feeling, must feel Himself. Else God would be out of all relation to us, certainly could be no example. When we are tempted, therefore, to impatience by the misconduct of those with whom we have to do, let us recall to mind God's long suffering, and recollect that we are, so to speak, His factors, His agents; dealing with His property, acting in His stead. This thought will dignify as well as relieve our sufferings from the perversity of others. Especially let us on such occasions set before us the example of Christ, in enduring what is emphatically called "the contradiction of sinners." What can anything be which we are called on to endure, in comparison with that which He endured!

We live in times which more than ever call for the exercise of this virtue. The prospects of the nation to which we belong, of the empire of which that nation forms a part, are darkened by the malevolent perversity of a small knot of men who rise to influence they could not otherwise attain by "troubling Israel;" by doing as much mischief as they can; by sowing everywhere seeds of bitterness; by preaching dishonesty and robbery and safe rebellion; by endeavouring to destroy the very mechanism of constitutional government. It is a gloomy outlook. Treason—cowardly, mean, pettifogging, but disastrous in its action—has crept even into the great council of the empire, and threatens to destroy it in its vitals. And those who have the power to eliminate the poison seem incapable of understanding the danger. Patience is here abundantly required by those who are the victims—too often the helpless victims—of this calculated mischief, of this disastrous incapacity. Certainly it is a strange spectacle that we now offer: a deliberate retrogression in civilisation; a return to barbarism; a breaking up of the social ties; a loosening of the imperial connection which alone makes this island habitable. The sins of the fathers—the selfishness, the pride, the contempt, the oppressions of former times—are being visited on the children to the third and fourth, aye, to the tenth generation. Nations never escape the penalty of national sins in this world, because they have no life beyond it. But we must call up sturdy resolve to bear what God shall put upon us, yea, even though it slay us, because we are assured that suffering in this life, borne in a Christian spirit, with meekness and with dignity, will produce a harvest of glory in the life to come. We have, therefore, need of patience; we have, all of us, in some measure borne the spoiling of our goods, in the general carnival of vice and compelled inaction of the last six years, years which have ruined thousands, and shaken the credit of every man in business throughout Ireland; and if we have not as yet been called on to resist unto blood, it may well be that that last worst trial is not far from us. But, if we let patience have her perfect work, we shall come out of the ordeal purified—less frivolous, less selfish; more conscious of our duties as members of the Church of Christ and citizens of the State; and when the tempest shall have spent itself, the air will be cleared and the face of social nature will be renewed. For God maketh the wrath of man to praise Him. If He "exalts the basest of men," as the Babylonian monarch tells us that He does, it is that they may perform the basest functions; they are His scavengers, His hangmen, so to speak; necessary instruments, who will be laid aside when they have done their work. For "where the carcase is," and only there, "will the vultures be gathered together."

But patience is not apathy. It is not sitting down and folding our hands and making no struggle to resist the evil. As citizens of the State, we have a duty to the State. That duty is to see, as far as we can, that violence shall not prevail; that property shall not be abolished; that murder shall not stalk red-handed through the land unpunished. Patience is not apathy, nor is it cowardice. It would be apathy to care nothing for what our brethren in other parts are suffering, so long as it does not touch ourselves. It would be cowardice if we were to allow the law to be infringed, when we could prevent it. We must not dignify such a procedure with the name of a Christian virtue. The magistrate, we are told, "beareth not the sword in vain." It is our duty to see that he does not so far as we can aid him. It is our duty to put down treason, so far as ever we can, no matter at what sacrifice of our own comfort—nay, even of our safety. For the powers that be are ordained of God, and it is the duty of every Christian to assist them in the struggle against disorder. In such a struggle we are on God's side against the power of evil; and if we meanly withdraw from it, we are denying our Master, and cannot expect His blessing.

Of the patient endurance of bodily suffering by disease, I shall say the less; because this is more obviously the Divine dispensation, and therefore refers us more immediately to the Divine will. What comes direct from God is easier to bear than what He inflicts through the malignity of man. And in sickness we feel ourselves more in God's hands than when we are well and strong. The very helplessness attending illness commends to us patience, because it exhibits impatience as being useless. If the disease be very serious—dangerous even—it recalls to us our uncertain tenure of life, and brings the future very near. If it be slight, it gives at least time for reflection. And if it be self-incurred, if it be the result of vice or misconduct, then we may well thank God for chastening us here, that we may escape punishment hereafter. There is no excuse whatever, for

impatience in that case. Let us rather thank God for the temporal infliction that may secure our eternal welfare.

It has become fashionable to decry patience in comparison with what people call the manlier virtues; energy and resolution and daring self-assertion. But patience is not unmanly when it is real submission to the Divine will; when, in other words, it is not cowardice. The resolve to endure what God shall put upon us may not make the figure in the world that enterprise and daring make, but it is quite as necessary, and plays quite as dignified a part, and quite as efficacious. The passive courage, which, in former days, could submit to the rack and the stake rather than deny God's Truth, is more difficult than the active courage which sends the soldier on the forlorn hope. There is always the chance of surviving in the latter case, and, at any rate, there is the certainty of high praise and flattering renown whether he survive or not; there is the ardour imparted by companionship and by the physical effort which strains the powers and nerves the soul for the collision with the foe. But to lie on the rack and feel it gradually tearing you asunder; to bear the flames, chained to the stake, in the presence of thousands cursing you, and who fancy they are doing God acceptable worship by consigning your soul to the fiends of hell—and this is what martyrdom meant not two hundred years ago—this requires high courage indeed, the courage that comes from realising that it is the will of God! And as great, as noble results have come from the passive courage which endures as from the active courage which enterprises. The greatest conquest of mankind ever yet made was made by Him, who "for the joy that was set before Him, and which all His true followers will share, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down for ever on the right hand of God."

## HOME CLAIMS AND EMIGRATION.

By the Rev. JOHN NAPLETON, Rector of Wymington, Diocese of Ely.

Sermon Preached (in substance) at the Parish Church, Wymington, on Sunday, February 7th, 1886, being the Sunday after the Consecration of the Bishop of Ely.

"Now the Lord had said unto Abram: Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee."—Genesis xii. 1.

WE are accustomed to regard Abraham as the central figure among the early patriarchs, the chief, if not the first in order of those holy men of old, who, following the divine promptings of the Holy Ghost, both spake and acted as they were moved by Him, the men after God's own heart. "We have Abraham to our father"; "Father Abraham, send Lazarus"; these, and similar expressions testify to the place *he* held in the Jewish mind, who was known as the "Father of the faithful", the Head, the Chief of that family chosen by God, to which all, be they faithful Jews or believing Christians, with one consent aspire to belong. This was Abraham's high honour, and we have in our text the first sound of his vocation. It is therefore on the teachings of family life that we must now strive to concentrate our thoughts, on family ties and obligations, and the blessings in store for those who do not lose sight of or ignore them.

This call of Abram contains a command, strange, hard, and unlooked for, requiring him to leave his country, his kindred, and his father's house, to go unto a land as yet untried, even unknown. Not until he had risen up to go did God acquaint him where he was to proceed, not until his heart had responded and consented to the call, was he told of his future destiny, as ruler and owner of the soil. He had simply obeyed the command: "Get thee unto a land that I will shew thee." He had started upon his journey trusting implicitly in the guidance and protection of Almighty God, not murmuring at the separation, but submitting to be led away, and accepting what he recognised as the ordering of a providence, that shapes our ends with a foresight and consideration that we cannot ourselves exercise in the disposal of our affairs. How different is this to the motive that induces so many persons to emigrate in these days! They do not ask: "Are we called upon to do this? Is it God's unmistakable good pleasure that we should go? Has He set before us a certainty of success and prosperity in some far-distant land; or are we exchanging a small, perhaps very inadequate provision for our wants at home, for a temptingly arrayed, but very improbable and vague possibility across the treacherous ocean? are we bound, or even called upon in any plain and righteous path of duty to leave all our home ties and form new ones?" Such questions as these are too often shelved, put aside in an impatient and restless spirit, that substitutes for their proper answers many a plausible excuse and artful pretence, the root of which is to be found in that longing for change, which is, when not properly controlled, such a baneful factor of many a steep and rugged life-course. One would think, to read the glowing accounts circulated by emigration agents, that to go to the Colonies was to go to another land of Canaan, only with this advantage over Abram, that men would now know where and why they were going, whereas he did not. And the class of readers who clutch at this sort of bait are, too often, the selfish and idle ones, who can get little work at home, and have neither the perseverance nor the determination which would fit them to do that little well, and so improve their opportunity

of getting more. They flatter themselves that they will be able to get more work and easier abroad; but they find, when too late, that it is no easier to live there without industry than it is at home. And when they have taken the fateful step, and crossed the ocean, there comes back to them a thought they tried to stifle when it first arose in their heart, the question: "Am I justified in leaving my home and my friends?" The mind then goes back in swift review across those ever-restless billows, far far back it carries the spirit, past the landing-stage where the foot last touched its mother-earth, along the rushing miles of rail-road and the quiet country lanes, till they reach the old, forsaken cottage in that peaceful village where their owner was born and bred up to a humble, yet an honourable employment. As the door is passed (*through*, not *by*, for the mind knows no barriers of wood or of stone, the spirit hath not flesh and bones,) the look reverts instinctively to the armchair in the chimney corner, the broken-down stooping figure that occupies it, and there swells up the first bitter pang of remorse! What! leave in their helplessness the parents who have been to us a strength and stay for so many years of childhood and youth? Leave also the younger generation—not our own offspring it may be; but yet of such nearness of kin as to claim our protection? This was not what Abram did. He buried his father in Haran, and then took with him Lot, his brother's son, and went on his journey. Having thus discharged his home duties, he was at liberty to go elsewhere, and so he followed where God led him. Thus, too, with all of us. We may not expect to perceive God's guiding hand if we quit our home without fulfilling those obligations which he has imposed upon us.

My younger brethren, to you especially would I say one earnest word on this point. Some of you may find work scarce, the quiet home life of your native village may perchance seem to you dull and monotonous, and there may be those who will tell you that now you are enfranchised, given a share —though it be no bigger than a man's hand—in the government of your country, you are bound to enlarge and improve your mind so as to qualify yourself for your new privilege, and this, as they pretend, you cannot do justly in the limits set by your present surroundings. Prompted by one or other of these considerations, if you do not emigrate to some distant land, you may be led to seek another—what is called the Black Country, where countless furnaces roar by day and by night, and vast mines are sunk beneath the earth. Do not, for all sakes, enter upon the Nomad life unless your conscience gives an unhesitating sanction to the change. Ask yourself whether you have duties at home, a charge laid upon you by God Himself, which you are bound to keep until he releases you from it. Because work is scarce and wages low, because wheat is "sold for a song" in England, does that lessen your obligation to cherish and provide bread for your nearest and dearest? Does it justify you in giving the loose rein to the wandering spirit? Much less does it warrant you in thinking that God has called you to be a "dweller in tents" like Abram. In fertile, sparsely populated countries this kind of life may have its advantages; but in our overcrowded land it is an inestimable drawback. Or home migration, turning the agricultural labourer into a factory hand, how beset with difficulties is this! Be sure of one thing, the man who neglects his home duties for the sake of cultivating his intellectual faculties by mixing with other men must miserably fail of his mark; for to aim at discovering how to lessen the poverty of others, and to benefit the largest number, when you leave unsolved what must be for you the greatest of all social problems, namely, how to support those dependent on you, —this is worse than foolish, it is wicked. There will ever be as great difficulty in the untrained, unrecommended agricultural labourer finding good work in the factory or the workshop, as there will be in the town-bred mechanic turning into a profitable source of income the small holding which he has no practical experience to guide him in cultivating, and no capital to procure the needful implements to work it with. Nay, my friends, seek not the nomad life without very unmistakable evidence that it is your proper vocation. What is the cause of much (ah, how much!) of the misery amongst the crowds of unemployed all over the land? Surely it is that, discontented and impatient, they have given up a small certainty for a wide pitiless uncertainty. They have left their houses without counting the cost; without a thought for those they leave behind, often to starve, whilst the vain hope of "better times" tarries longer and longer; without God's blessing asked or thought of; without any recommendation whatever. If some central agencies were established under good management where men's abilities and characters could be ascertained, and thus employment for them be secured, the shoals of begging letters and similar impostures would be replaced in deserving instances by letters commendatory, and the capable and worthy would have a fair chance of getting work, while the idle, the restless, and the wandering spirits would be no better off than before.

Oh, then, dear friends in Christ, do not do despite to His Spirit, and thus bring trouble upon yourselves. It was in the spirit of submission to the first, and therefore the highest duties, that Abram obeyed the call of God, because God was his Father, and called him to go to an untried Canaan. It was the same spirit of submission which our Blessed Master exhibited when he left his Father's home on high to come into the world. It was, too, the spirit of true loyalty that led Abram to discharge his duty to his father Terah, and to

his dead brother's son Lot, and thus to take them with him. We, too, should see in the small family emigrating at God's command the picture, the index of all community life. Nowadays it is the fashion to give the preference to all town life rather than to small village homes. How different to the true principle, namely, that the smaller the community, the closer the tie that binds it together. The Jewish people began with one family; the Christian Church sprang from one small band of disciples gathered together in an upper room. Say not then, you have no scope for doing God's work as well as your own at home. By precept, by example, by the force of sympathy, and encouragement you may do, each one your part, a very important part too, if duly performed, in the gathering in of Christ's family.

The family of Christ! Is it left on earth without any appointed chiefs, any rulers and guides, any fathers in God? Not so! As He sent forth Abram of old—as He sent forth His own chosen and ordained ministers and pastors—He the Head, the Patriarch, they the Apostles, Prophets and Teachers, so does He send them now. As many wander now from the family and the hearth, so do many more choose out some way for themselves. Because they like not well some doctrine or discipline of the Church of their fathers, they go out from her, they emigrate to some unauthorised, man-devised community of their own fancy. Abram did not see his way clearly, did not understand whither or why God would have him go; but he went in faith. These discontented ones will not brook a single thing they cannot understand or do not like; but prefer to weaken the cause of Christianity by their endless divisions. Truly has it been acknowledged of the Church of England by the English head of that usurping Church which has been her most virulent opponent in times past, that she is the "great bulwark against infidelity in this country!" She is the "Mother-home" of every soul in the land, of every Englishman who has been baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus. She too has her family branches—her dioceses, and her parishes; her leaders, both laymen and clergy. One of the latter has just been commissioned by the laying on of hands to undertake the fatherhood of our own diocese. May the command, "Get thee out of thy country and thy kindred to a land that I will show thee," be received and acted upon by him who has asked our prayers, and for the sake of God and the Church, has given up a life of comparative obscurity to come to the front amongst the lowest as well as the highest, and carry on the work of a true soldier and servant of Christ! Oh, may the Master give to each their portion in due season! To him that is beginning his course, strength, honour, wisdom; and to him whose course is finished, an eternal inheritance in the blessed company of the saints at rest!

For Health and Immortality.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1886.

## MAINTENANCE OF THE CLERGY.

THE treatment which the Clergy of the Church of England receive from the institution which they serve, is both irrational and unjust. Duties are imposed upon them, which the members of their communion profess to consider highly important, but little thought is given to the best means of fitting them for those duties, or enabling them to subsist while performing them. They are permitted and encouraged to marry, under the belief that a married clergy is, on the whole, the most useful and the least dangerous to the nation. But a large part of them have no means provided to assist them in maintaining the family which is, to persons living a moral and wholesome life, as most of them do, more inevitable, and likely to be more numerous, than to married men in most other professions. They are required to "forsake and set aside all worldly cares and studies," and are absolutely forbidden to engage in any lucrative trades and professions; and while thus deprived of all opportunities of earning an addition to their scanty incomes, there is offered to them no substitute. They are required to give the services of their best years at a very inadequate remuneration, and when their working powers are spent, they find themselves reduced to the alternative of either retaining duties which it is no longer possible for them to fulfil, or of throwing themselves in old age, with their families, out of house and home, and into destitution.

It is not sufficient to apply palliatives to a few of the more glaring evils, as is done by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, by affording facilities for the augmentation of small benefices, and by the Society for Enlarging the Stipends of Curates. The whole condition of the clergy should be thoroughly examined, and settled on a satisfactory basis.

II. We now offer the first outline sketches of a few proposals for improving the condition of the clergy.

1. *A Common Fund*, of which the clergy should receive the dividends. This might be either

general or diocesan—we think the latter preferable. It should be so distributed as to raise all incomes up to some minimum figure.

2. *Great Educational Establishments*, in which the children of the clergy should have either absolutely free, or liberally assisted, educations. There are establishments of this kind for the children of missionaries employed abroad, why not for those of the clergy who work at home, seeing that the latter, as well as the former, sacrifice to the Church their prospects of lucrative employment?

3. *Pensions.* These are already provided for by Acts recently passed, and they are adequate in cases where the benefice has an ample income. But a poor benefice is impoverished for many years, when a man in chronic sickness or decrepitude is imposed upon it as a pensioner. In all benefices below a certain value, some central or diocesan fund should provide the pension.

III. We proceed, in the last place, to consider the ways and means.

1. *Abolition of all remaining Sinecures.* We believe that attention was first called to the absolute uselessness of Deaneries and several other Cathedral offices by Dr. Arnold, between forty and fifty years ago. The same ideas have lately been put forward with great force by Bishop Ryle, of Liverpool. It is impossible to imagine an official more useless than a dean, or money more entirely wasted, than that which forms his salary. By abolishing this one office, and regulating the emoluments of members of Cathedral bodies according to the services which they render, an annual income of about £2,000 a year might be saved in each ancient diocese to form a nucleus for a fund for augmenting clerical stipends and providing pensions.

2. *Retrenchment of useless Church Expenditure.* An enormous part of the income of the Church is now lavished on useless ostentation. Bishop King, in his ridiculous mitre, is a type of the evil tendency towards clerical and congregational display, which has ruled the Church for many past years under the pretence of doing God service. The money thus wasted would go a very long way towards improving the condition of the clergy.

3. *The Ecclesiastical Commissioners.* The money in the hands of these functionaries would be much better employed if its income were devoted to sustentation, instead of endowment. Enlarged endowments only serve to inflame the cupidity of the demagogues and their adherents, and our posterity will, surely, be quite as able to supply their own spiritual needs as we are, and there is no duty incumbent upon us to provide for them.

We offer this merely as a sketch to be hereafter filled up, but we venture to think that we have traced the main lines which a thorough reform ought to follow.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### EUCHARISTIC WORSHIP.

SIR,—Your correspondents must not blame me for occupying space in replying to their remarks and inquiries. I will try to be as brief as I may.

First, in answer to "An Irish Churchman," it must be clear, to most readers at least, that when I spoke of (1) Intercession and (2) Adoration I was referring to the duty of (1) Prayer for the Departed and (2) Eucharistic Worship, with which I had dealt in the earlier part of the same letter.

Now, in reference to Mr. Courtenay Moore, my expression, which startles him, of the moonlight and starlight of the Irish Church for three hundred years, and the sunlight of the Roman Communion, applies to public worship, and to that alone. I do not for a moment deny that educated Irish Churchmen possess higher and clearer moral and spiritual light than even devout Roman Catholics — speaking generally — a stronger sense of the Fatherhood of God, a more definite view of the Atonement, a firmer hold on the divine obligation of the moral law. I admit freely what "An Irish Parson" insists upon, that the doctrine of the Real Presence does not necessarily make the people who believe in it "honest or truthful." Of course not; but it makes them devout. It bows all heads and bends all knees before "the Lamb that was slain," the Crucified upon the Tree, the Lord Jesus Christ. I repeat that there is no security for *popular* devotion without immediate sacramental worship. This is the privilege of the great Latin and Greek Churches. It involves no theory of transubstantiation or consubstantiation, but simply the belief (1) that the Lord Jesus Christ is still the Lamb in the midst of the Throne; that He feels for us and with us in all our trials and troubles; that He is wounded perpetually in the house of His friends; and (2) that, as the true High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, He brings forth bread and wine in His Church, and presents Himself as the Lamb that was slain, by bread and wine, at the earthly altars of the kingdom of heaven on earth.

His Presence is *super-local*, but it is also *real*. It is not by way of substitution for earthly elements; we cannot say of "a spiritual body" whether it can or cannot be actually present in more places than one. The Black Rubric, as I have repeatedly shown, is simply out of court. Our Lord has no natural body anywhere now. His natural body has become spiritual. In Holy Communion he gives Himself by His Body and by His Blood, *i.e.*, first as life, then as purity, always Himself, but with the specific blessings which He calls His Body and His Blood. But we are not to worship His Body or His Blood, or to present these to the Father, but only to worship the Lord Jesus Christ, and present Him as the perpetual holocaust of Love, the Living Propitiation for the sins of the whole world.

I cannot force any one to use his mind to accept any definition. But the East and the West believe alike that the Lord Jesus is mysteriously present, and is, as such, to be adored; and what I have said and say is this,—that the sense of the *immediate* presence of the Sun of Righteousness, in His redeeming love,

is sunlight! To live upon the memory of the past, not seeing that the past lives in the present, is moonlight and starlight. If the Lord Jesus Christ be still working for us, and, *in a sense*, suffering (as I contend) by perfect fellowship, no longer as a satisfaction for sin, no longer in the anguish and darkness of Calvary, but as the Living Propitiation for the sins of the whole word,—*then*, this is a vital truth, the loss of which is fatal to Church-life. The work of the Holy Spirit may make up for this in many cases, and does so; but as far as the vast multitude are concerned, ninety-nine out of every hundred, there is no real substitute possible for immediate sacramental worship. Closely is this connected with prayer for the departed. Our Lord Jesus Christ is ever energising for them, sending forth the Holy Spirit into the hearts of His "banished," and His true servants follow Him, the Lamb, whithersoever He goeth, and therefore pray with Him. And this is equally true of the saints who are glorified, and of well-instructed Christians here.

There is no alternative save practical denial of the Incarnation, which lives in the blessed Sacrament. If there be no way, no place, no time,—then nothing but Theism remains logically possible.

I do not expect good men to see this at once. To insist on the errors of Rome perpetually may be needful, but is scarcely profitable. O that God would pour the Spirit of love and grace into the hearts of all His servants, and quicken our affections for the realisation of Divine truth, and of our Blessed Lord's enduring love!

For me, I would far rather not be called "High-Church" or "Broad-Church," but simply a humble Christian.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
February 13, 1886.

## ARCHBISHOP BENSON ON EVENING COMMUNION.

SIR,—The Archbishop returns to this subject no less than three times in his Charge, showing thereby his own estimate of its importance. The principal passage you have given yourself in your last number. It is page 166. The two others are as follows:—

The hours of Communion. Neither of the more usual hours are adequate to enable masses of the people who live by compulsory time-tables to receive the great gift. Yet I am sure we are not driven to any such departure from the universal common sense of the Universal Church as the rashly-adventured Evening Communion.—Pp. 95, 96.

Next come the powers of Confirmation and of Communion. Unless the indulgences of Evening Communion, and of the drama of Non-Communion, gain ground, the immense moral force of the steady self-examination . . . effects more than anything else can do, and then it is sealed with the Seal of God.—P. 190.

It is a great satisfaction to me to find that my review has drawn so much attention, and produced so much discussion. "Presbyter" must pardon me, if I venture to think that his last letter needs no reply.

THE WRITER OF THE IMPUGNED REVIEW.

## THE DEMONS AND THE SWINE.

SIR,—I do not like to leave "M.'s" appeal to me unnoticed, yet I fear that I cannot give him much satisfaction. Serious students of truth cannot pretend to be even on bowing terms with the Omniscience, with which slashing reviewers are so intimate. Christianity is no complete and rounded philosophy of the Universe. We know but in part, and the fragments of our knowledge are but islets in the ocean of our ignorance. Out of the mystery of the spirit-world the gleams of light which reach us are but few.

The view of Biblical inspiration which an expositor holds will govern to a considerable extent his treatment of the narrative of the demons and the swine. Setting aside the thorough-going rationalists, with whom we have no concern, three classes of expositors may be named. The first, of which the late Bishop Wordsworth may be taken as a type, holding to the rigid theory of verbal inspiration and the absolute infallibility of the letter of Scripture, are bound to take the narrative in its most literal sense; and they see in it a proof and a solemn warning of the power and fierceness of Satan and his associate fiends, who, as the demons drove the swine into the sea, will hereafter drive the wicked into the lake of fire. A second class, like Stier and Alford, holding a somewhat freer and less mechanical view of inspiration, such as admits of small discrepancies and mistakes, still maintain the historical reality of the entrance of the demons into the swine, on the ground that it is impossible to give up a circumstantial narrative, attested by all the three synoptists, without endangering the entire credibility of the Gospels. Then there is a third class, in which Neander and Farrar may be reckoned, whose view of inspiration is wide enough to allow of a considerable human element in the sacred writings; these venture to set aside the literal statement about the entrance of the devils into the swine, and suppose it to have originated in an attempt to explain what happened, by an application to it of popular but erroneous ideas.

Of course this last solution is the simplest and easiest, if only we can satisfy ourselves that the view of inspiration on which it rests is admissible, because it gets rid of the enormous difficulty of understanding how brute creatures can be inwardly possessed and impelled by evil spirits. Before we can adopt it, however, we must suppose that the request of the demons, and our Lord's answer, "Go," crept unauthorised into the primitive tradition, and thus came to appear in the three Gospels; and from this many devout minds cannot help shrinking.

I do not know that much help is to be got from the various explanations which have been offered of the narrative as it stands. If we ask why the demons wished to enter the swine, we are told that their malicious nature impelled them to destroy something, and having been forced out of the man, they flew at the swine as a *pis-aller*. Or if we question the possibility of demoniacal possession for the brute, it is suggested that both man and brute possess the animal soul, the seat of lustful desire, and it is especially this in which demons find their domicile. As to the effect on the demons of the drowning of the swine, I am not aware that any one suggests that the demons suffered by it, and thus received punishment for their cruelty. Some have supposed that the swine were kept either by Jews, or to supply food for Jews, contrary to the Mosaic law, and were therefore justly snatched from their owners. As for the animals themselves, they only perished a little before their time, and their sudden destruction was amply justified by the spiritual lesson of which it was the vehicle.

Happily the whole matter is speculative rather than practical, and excites curiosity more than it affects edification, Whichever way we take it, the important lesson remains the same. Even if we doubt whether the demons are real spirits, or merely personified evil passions, adverse influences, and disordered faculties of our nature, the underlying truth is unaltered. Christ shines through the narrative as the great Healer of our nature, the Rectifier of its disorders, the Restorer of its purity and peace. Tyrannised over we may have once been by the demons of corrupt passion and desire, but at His word they will leave us and fly headlong. Stripped we may have been by them of our self-control, and our robe of innocence and honour, but through His grace we may be found sitting at His feet, clothed, and in our right mind.

PRESBYTER.

## MR. GURNEY AND HOME RULE.

SIR,—There is certainly no purpose to be served by the Rev. A. Gurney carrying on a controversy with me, about the meaning of the word *nation*. It is quite enough that those who have read his letters and mine must be satisfied, now, had they not known it before, that there are two races (let us call them), of people in Ireland, of different extraction, religion, moral sentiments, and political affections. As for the absorption of the colonists by the natives, according to the proverb, that they became *Hibernicis ipsis Hiberniores*, that process ceased at the Reformation. the greater numbers, and the different religion of the later colonists, have kept them separate. Swift says in one of his pamphlets, that the English in Ireland are more civilised than the English of most counties of England; and few persons are to be found who say that the descendants of those whom Swift knew have degenerated much.

When I find an English gentleman of more than common intelligence and information quoting a proverb one hundred years old, applicable to its own time, and not in any degree whatever to the present; and ignoring, through its wrong application, the fundamental fact of Irish society and politics, I cannot wonder that his views of that society and of those politics should be nothing but delusions. I must leave him to his admiration, unaccountable to me, of that race, the originals of the Yahoos. I may even pity his mistake, when he finds the guest, in whom, attracted by that guest's agreeable qualities, he has reposed too much confidence, engaged in a conspiracy with his old butler of fifty years' service to rob the plate-chest. But when Mr. Gurney says that the approaching action of the legislature will be an answer to my contention that a Dublin Parliament won't do, I do feel called on to make some reply. Does your correspondent not see that the establishment of a Dublin Parliament will not settle the question, but raise it? He hopes, with a vague hope founded on nothing, that the experiment would be successful. We in Ulster know that it would produce civil war; in which we have some confidence that we would ultimately, perhaps with speed, win. We claim to understand our own business. The disaffected half of Ireland claims to understand its business. I admit the claim; but the business that it would enter upon, so soon as it should have the power, would be the business of destroying the British Empire; of robbing all respectable people in this country of their property; of destroying the civilisation, such as it is, of Ireland; and very likely, in the course of these proceedings, of murdering all Protestants in the unprotected parts.

That man is indeed sanguine who expects a "wise and safe measure" from a set of politicians whose hitherto measures, when carried into effect, have been dismal and contemptible failures. The abolition of the Irish Church Establishment was a "message of peace;" a phrase that, now, has only to be repeated to excite either a sneer of contempt or a frown of indignation. The Land Act of five years ago was to "settle" the "Land question"; it has raised it into a ten-fold more threatening aspect.

A few words more; Mr. Gurney sets great store on a recent declaration of the Bishop of Rome about toleration. I doubt not that your correspondent has some knowledge of the history of former bishops of that city, and of the gang of anti-social conspirators that has with perpetual succession infested it, and troubled Europe for many centuries. Whensoever it shall come to suit the notions of that gang to have the declaration referred to disavowed, they will find no difficulty in getting a pope to disavow it; or, if it should suit them to have it nominally in existence while they act contrary to it, they will have no scruple in following that course.

SUBSCRIBER.

February 13, 1886.

SIR,—Mr. Archer Gurney's letters, advocating separate Parliaments for Ireland and Scotland, suggest the question whether he knows the wishes of those two integral parts of the United Kingdom of Great Britain? If I know anything of those two countries, I should say they do not wish such disintegration. It is no conclusive reason that eighty-five Irish M.P.'s will vote for a Parliament in Dublin. Mr. Gurney will allow this as common sense. He is not our Prime Minister, always aiming at place, lawfully if he can, unlawfully if he may; he has evidently a desire to do justice without a sole eye to place and power; therefore, I may ask, has he considered the real state of law-abiding Ireland and Scotland? Do the most enlightened and law-abiding endorse his views? If the idea of separate Parliaments is to hold good, why should not Wales, and the Isle of Man, Alderney, Guernsey, Sark, be treated in the same way? Why should not legislative powers be given to every English county? What is affiliation? Where is disintegration to end?

A PUZZLED MAN.

SIR,—I have read several letters on the Irish Question written by Mr. Gurney, and as they have not been seriously grappled with by any of your correspondents, perhaps you would allow me space to consider his position. He advocates, as I understand him, an Irish parliament to manage Irish affairs, in which the Upper House is to consist of temporal peers and spiritual representatives of the Church of Ireland—the Presbyterian and Roman Churches. He advocates this policy to meet the Irish sentiment for self-government, and to prove to Irish Romanists that England is prepared "to meet them on a footing of strict justice and equality," and he supposes that this policy would promote loyalty to the Empire and the Crown.

Now, the first and natural question is—Would this policy meet the Irish aspirations to which Mr. Gurney refers? If not, then I submit it is useless, nay, positively mischievous. For to admit that Irish sentiment must be pleased, and to accept an English theory as to what constitutes that sentiment, is on the face of it an absurdity.

Let me then ask your correspondent what section of the Irish people does he propose to conciliate by this concession? The Church of Ireland certainly does not want it; she has again and again repudiated the Home Rule scheme, and in this respect she is at one with the Presbyterian Church. Now, this reduces the question to Rome—Would this scheme satisfy that section of the Irish people who, led by bishops and priests and demagogues, have declared for self-government? Would it please Rome? This question can best be answered by another. Would it place in the hands of Rome absolute authority over all institutions—all schools and other religious systems—over, in fact, every branch of life? Would it give to Rome the Dublin cathedrals and the other buildings which, but a few days ago, we were told Rome meant to claim? Would it afford full scope for the confiscation of the Irish Church funds now held by the representative body, and for the alienation of Trinity College endowments, or the appropriation of it as a whole by the Church of the majority? If not, I take leave to assure Mr. Gurney that Ireland would not be governed according to Irish ideas, and I challenge any one who doubts my statement to read for himself the history of this country, and to refute my assertion, calmly made, without passion or excitement, that Irish patriotism, the moment it has a free hand, developes into the plunder and extermination of Protestants. Give Ireland a free hand this month, and before the 1st day of May the North and South would stand opposed to each other in armed strife. But then we would get guarantees ! ! ! But who would guarantee the protection of the minority? Mr. Parnell is a landlord. Did this fact save the landlords from plunder? Would his Protestantism guarantee the rights of the minority? But would Mr. Gurney's scheme satisfy Ireland? I answer fearlessly, it would not. The Church of Rome wants ascendancy. She wants power not alone over her own flock—that she has already—but she wants absolute control over education in all its branches, over all public departments, over every institution in the island. Without that power she will never rest, and before that power is hers the hardy sons of Ulster will see the streams of Ireland run red with blood from the Giant's Causeway to Cape Clear. But there is another power in Ireland, and that too, the real power, before which Rome is as helpless as Messrs. Gladstone, Morley and Co., in whose presence Parnell and his merry men have to speak with bated breath, which looks with scorn on such concessions as that of Mr. Gurney, the power of the I.R.B., the Fenianism that has stood aside to let Parnell have his way, but which, as James Stephens, the C.O.I.R., lately pointed out, cannot stop short when Parnell is done, but will then go on to work out the real, true, and deep-seated Irish passion, not sentiment, for an Ireland free from English control—an Irish Republic.

Irish by birth, I know the Irish grievance. It is this. The presence in Ireland of English rule in any shape or form. Will Mr. Gurney meet this aspiration? If not, why write about concessions which Irishmen laugh to scorn? What would be the use of an Irish Parliament if it would not realise the dream of Ireland for centuries? That dream for the priesthood is the establishment, without a rival, of the Church of Rome; for the peasant, the recovery, how he cares not, of the land which England confiscated three hundred years ago; for the American fillibuster it means plunder and lawlessness; for the reckless demagogue, license without curb or check.

In the name of common sense, who that has read our Irish newspapers for months, can doubt what would happen here if we were ruled by the National League? But then, the majority are for Home Rule. True; but the majority in London are for pillage and mob law. Does Mr. Gurney therefore think mob law should be set up? Would the National League enforce the payment of rents? But then, the bishops and priests are for Home Rule! True, they are with the people, but they are led; not leaders. Let the Curtin episode warn Englishmen, if they can be warned, that neither priest nor bishop can stem the torrent of Irish passion, though both have proved capable ministers in raising the present furious strife. Have your readers forgotten that Grattan agitated within the lines of the Constitution, and Wolf Tone behind him, raised the black flag of Communism, that O'Connell was the Constitutional agitator, while behind loomed Young Ireland, that Butt spoke loftily about the Empire, while the real force lay in the Fenians? Parnell may agitate as he likes, but his master has not yet had his say. With which party will Mr. Gurney effect a compromise? Should he answer—With neither, but with all Ireland—the reply is simple; he cannot, for Ulster will not have Home Rule, and declines any compromise. To conciliate rebel Ireland you must join the rebel, and turn your united force against your loyal allies; of course, you can make them rebels. Only Englishmen won't like the task of using the rifle and bayonet on men whose only crime is that they trusted in English faith, and were loyal to England's Queen. Truth to tell, we in Ireland are weary of strife. We are weary of hearing every day tales of misery and brutal atrocity, which make us wonder where our rulers live, and why we are so heavily taxed. We are weary, and perhaps often a little impatient, because Englishmen can understand everything except the state and the wants of Ireland. Ours has been a hard battle, and our foes have been they of our own household; what wonder, if men sometimes turn wistful eyes to the New World and wish that England would indeed enable the loyal minority in thousands and tens of thousands to transfer their honesty, their industry, their business habits to the great continent where life and property are safe under the stars and stripes. But God alone can tell the end. We believe in Him, and we know that when the end comes, as come it will when Home Rule is granted, and the Irish wolf-hound drives the Ulster garrison to bay, then England at last will awake to find her name dishonoured and despised, as the perfidious mother who betrayed her own flesh and blood, and the Irish Question will begin over again in fresh conquests and fresh confiscation. Well! *Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat.*

It is almost amusing, only it is so terrible, when we hear of the police and taxes being handed over to the League. Fancy the pleasure of living in Ireland when the Moonlighters become the police, and men like James Carey are magistrates.

THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.

The Vicarage, Warrenpoint.

## A DILEMMA! THE GORHAM DECISION, OR THE CHARITABLE HYPOTHESIS—WHICH?

SIR,—There is almost inconceivable ignorance as to this question. Many think that they have adopted both the Gorham Decision and the charitable hypothesis. But they are directly opposed, the one to the other. To hold them both is impossible.

1. What is the Gorham Decision? That Regeneration means Conversion; and, therefore, that it may take place before, in, or after, Baptism. This theory was supported by quotations from the Georgian Divines, such as Seekar, who, no doubt, addressed baptized persons as unregenerate, meaning unconverted. This is one horn of the dilemma, that Regeneration means Conversion.

2. Take the other horn, the charitable hypothesis, that is, that we hope that the infant, or adult, is regenerated, as we assert, in Baptism. Now, it is impossible that we can hope that either infant or adult is converted in Baptism. So the "Conversion" theory and the "hope" theory are irreconcilable.

3. As to Infants.—They cannot be converted at the Font, "by reason of their tender age." No clergyman or layman can charitably hope that the infant is then converted. Therefore what he hopes charitably, and asserts to God, and before God and the congregation, cannot be the Conversion which the Gorham Decision rules regeneration to be.

4. Next, as to Adults.—They come to the Font as already converted. The clergyman cannot then charitably hope that they have, in the rite, been converted, except on the idea that the Service takes it for granted that they come up as hypocrites. This is absurd and impossible.

5. Let anyone honestly take either alternative. He may, with the Privy Council, say that Regeneration is Conversion. But then he must give up the Services; or else he may take the charitable hypothesis, but then he must give up the Conversion theory, for he cannot hope that infants are converted, and neither can he believe that the Adult Baptismal Service was drawn up with the idea that all adults come up in hyprocrisy.

6. Everyone must be impaled on one horn or the other. The charitable hypothesis rejects Conversion, and Conversion makes the charitable hypothesis impossible. And yet I do believe that many, both in England and Ireland, congratulate themselves on being supported in their Baptismal theory by the Gorham Decision and the charitable hypothesis.

7. The way out of both difficulties is Bishop Bethel's, that Regeneration is God's adoption of the candidate, and that it is not a change of nature but a change of relation to God.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN FOR MARCH, 1886.—SELECTED BY THE REV. JOHN NAPLETON.—7th, Quinquagesima Sunday. Morning: 210, 245, 309. Evening: 262, 356, 29.—14th, First Sunday in Lent. Morning: 88, 251, 84. Evening: 92, 244, 184.—21st, Second Sunday in Lent. Morning: 209, 183, 279. Evening: 248, 216, 265.—28th, Third Sunday in Lent. Morning: 373, 198, 449. Evening: 85, 338, 12.

THE will of the late Archbishop of Armagh has been proved, the personalty being sworn at upwards of £91,000. The property is left chiefly to the family.

ON Saturday, at St. Michael's, Paddington, the Bishop of London will admit a number of candidates to the order of deaconess. The service will be at half-past eleven.

ACCORDING to the *Liverpool Mercury* "Lord Penzance is said to be ill. His London house is dismantled, and he has been residing for some time at Godalming, where he has been suffering from a complication of diseases. It does not, therefore, seem probable that he will be able to go to York" to decide the case of Mr. Bell Cox. The same paper says it is understood that the Lower House of the Convocation of York will insist on dealing with the matter at the end of this month, and that any attempt to stifle discussion will be resisted.

THE Bishop of St. Asaph has appointed the Rev. David Richard Thomas, vicar of Meifod, Montgomeryshire, to the archdeaconry and canonry residentiary of St. Asaph, vacant by the death of Archdeacon Ffoulkes. Mr. Thomas was a scholar of Jesus College, Oxford, where he graduated (3rd cl. *Lit. Hum.*,) in 1855. He was ordained in 1857, and was appointed vicar of Meifod twenty years later. He is a Proctor in Convocation. He is a prominent Welsh antiquary, and author of a history of the diocese of St. Asaph and other publications in English and Welsh.

THE Earl of Selborne, speaking at Derby last week, at a meeting of the Church of England Working Men's Society, deplored the active political warfare that was going on against the Church. Supposing the Church were abolished, he asked, would any better machinery be set up in its place? Was it proposed to remove it for the sake of some greater instrument of good? Not at all. As he understood the matter they wanted to take it away for taking away's sake. He warned his hearers against identifying the Church with one political party? for it was most desirable that men of all parties should belong to the Church; but, at the same time, they must not sacrifice the cause of the Church to any party objects whatever.

LAST week the Church Missionary Society held a large number of meetings in different parts of the country, from Penzance to Alnwick, with a view to increase the interest of the public in the work of spreading the Gospel. The *Record* printed brief notices received from nearly a hundred centres, and added that in the extreme north reports by every post left no doubt that a spirit of real and genuine zeal and devotion had been aroused, which would not quickly pass away. The news respecting the murder of Bishop Hannington was referred to at most of the meetings, and created a profound impression, and much sympathy was expressed with his bereaved family.

A TABLET has been placed in St. Paul's, Kersal, with the following inscription:—"In memory of James Fraser, D.D., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, born August 18, 1818, who, as Bishop of Manchester, shone in England as a preacher of righteousness, spending all his strength, for fifteen years, with a good courage and a cheerful heart in

the service of Christ's flock in Lancashire. He entered into rest October 22, 1885, at Bishop's Court, in this parish. His fellow parishioners, among whom he lived and died, set up this tablet here where he was wont to worship, thanking God for him." The frame surrounding the slab is of alabaster, carved in the late Gothic style to correspond with the church. In the upper part appear the late Bishop's arms, with mitre, and the motto "Je suis prest" executed in relief and painted in heraldic colours.

On the 10th inst., at the theatre of the University of London, the Bishop of Oxford distributed certificates and prizes awarded at the Oxford Local Examinations. In the course of his remarks his lordship said :—" In scrutinising the lists it has been a cause of great satisfaction to me to find that so much of your success has been attained in the department of language. One of you, I see—Mr. Spragg, from St. Olave's Grammar School, Southwark — stands first in all England in Latin, first in English, and besides occupies an honourable place in the class list of religious knowledge. (Cheers.) There are, I think, four other senior candidates who appear in the first class in the division of languages. I am well aware that it is not the fashion on occasions of this kind to set a high value on literary or linguistic success. May I briefly explain why, in this matter, I decline to follow the fashion, and why I congratulate you heartily on the direction which your studies seem generally to have taken? In the first place, observation has led me to doubt whether there is any considerable number of young persons who have that natural aptitude for physical science which is necessary in order to make it a good instrument of general education. Some there are, no doubt, who have an eminent aptitude for it ; and it was a great evil in our old system of education that for such minds no provision was made. When I entered one of our greatest public schools, some fifty-five years ago, I do not think that there was a single boy who could give an account of the simplest mechanical powers—nay, who could solve an equation or accompany Euclid over the Asses' Bridge. I am glad that we have changed all that. But I still think that the number of those who are so constituted as to be educated entirely or mainly through the discipline of physical science is small ; the number of those who can be trained even by mathematics alone is not very large. But I challenge the worshippers of physical science on their own ground, the ground of utility. (Cheers.) An eminent man of science not long since dilated on the wonderful saving of time and temper effected by the invention of lucifer matches. I entirely agree with him, for I remember the old tinder-box in its most provoking condition. But for enjoying the useful match-box of our day it is not needful that I should invent or even understand it. It is good for me to comprehend the working of the common pump ; nevertheless I should leave the mending of my pump, however great my knowledge, absolutely in the plumber's hands. But if it is a case of broken language there is no one whom I can ask to mend it. I must understand it myself, or it is of no use at all. Language is an instrument of universal service, of absolute necessity. Its possession is the great practical distinction between man and the creatures round him. The child struggles after it, feels his want of it, in earliest infancy. A perfect mastery of it is essential to success in the highest spheres of human influence. The knowledge of words, it has been said, is the knowledge of things. I am sure that you cannot attain to a mastery of the subtle felicities of language without gaining also such knowledge of vast tracts of human life, of old experience, and of earnest thought, as will store your minds with fruitful ideas and sweet memories, and secure you a grateful auditory wherever your words are heard." (Cheers.)

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Cavis-Brown, Rev. J., M.A., Priest-Vicar ; Succentor of Chichester Cathedral.
Clarke, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Low Wray.
Currie, Rev. Sir Frederick Larkins, Bart., Vicar of Exton, Bishop's Waltham ; Rector of Old Alresford.
Davies, Rev. J. S., Vicar of St. Matthias's, Birmingham.
Fenwick, Rev. William Augustus, M.A., Assistant Curate of St. James's, Norlands, Notting Hill ; Vicar of St. Germains, Cornwall.
Garniss, Rev. Thomas James, Rector of Holton.
Hodges, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Blacklands, Hastings ; Chaplain to the Hastings Borough Cemetery.
Jesse, Rev. Eustace Tennyson d'Eyncourt, M.A., Rector of Kirkley, South Lowestoft.
Letchworth, Rev. H. H., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Southampton ; Rector of Exton, Bishop's Waltham.
McAnally, Rev. D. Lancaster, M.A., Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty at Hampton Court Palace.
Orr, Rev. Alexander, Rector of Cheriton, Rural Dean of Alresford.
Simmins, Rev. J. Henry S., M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Sunderland ; Vicar of Westoe, South Shields.
Thomas, Rev. David Richard, Vicar of Meifod ; Archdeacon of Montgomery and Canon Residentiary of St. Asaph Cathedral.
Wells, Rev. Edward, B.A., Rector of West Dean-cum-East Grimstead.
Wilson, Rev. Robert Spedding, M.A., Rector of Stoke Bruerne; Rector of Girton.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Burgess, Rev. Henry, LL.D., for twenty-five years Vicar of Whitlesey St. Andrew, on the 10th inst., aged 78 years.
Hardy, Rev. Clement Le, M.A., formerly Rector of St. Peter's, Jersey, at Nice, on the 8th inst., aged 79.
Hassall, Rev. James, Vicar of St. John the Baptist's, at his residence, 420, Park Road, Toxteth Park, Liverpool, on the 10th inst., aged 79 years.
Hayter-Hames, Rev. H. G., Rector of Chagford, at Chagford, on the 9th inst.
Horn, Rev. G. T., M.A., formerly of Haverfordwest, at College Street, Islington, N., on the 10th inst., aged 54.
Hughes, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Ebbw Vale, J.P., for the County of Monmouth, at the Parsonage, Ebbw Vale, Mon., on the 15th inst., in his 66th year.
Iremonger, Rev. Thomas Lascelles, forty-seven years Vicar of Goodworth Clatford and Wherwell, on the 6th inst., aged 70.
Lewthwaite, Rev. Joseph, Vicar of Kelstern, at Louth, on the 7th inst.
Perkins, Rev. Benjamin Robert, B.C.L., late Vicar of the parish (for fifty two years), formerly Chaplain of Christ Church, Oxon, and Incumbent of Linslade, and Curate-in-Charge of Cublington, at Wotton-under-Edge, on the 7th inst., aged 88.
Tulloch, Very Rev. John, D.D., LL.D., Vice-Chancellor of the University of St. Andrew's, Principal and Primarius Professor of Divinity, St. Mary's College, Dean of the Order of the Thistle, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary in Scotland, at Torquay, on the 13th inst., aged 63.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## ON HEARING SERMONS.

By the Rev. A. W. MOMERIE, M.A., D.Sc., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at King's College, London, and Preacher at the Foundling Hospital.

Sermon Preached at the Foundling Hospital, on Sunday, February 14th, 1886.

"Take heed what ye hear."—Mark iv. 24.

WE have been engaged the last three Sundays in considering the duties of the pulpit. I should like this morning to offer a few remarks in regard to the duties of the pew.

Now the first duty of the hearer is, to make himself acquainted with the purpose of preaching. Those who are endowed with reason ought to act reasonably; and, therefore, everyone who is in the habit of hearing sermons, ought to understand why he does so, ought to have some definite expectation of being the better for them, ought to know exactly the results which sermons may be expected to accomplish. Now the Gospel, as we have seen, is concerned with conduct. And since the conduct of men is determined by their beliefs and their emotions, the preacher's business will be to help them to such beliefs, and foster in them such emotions, as will tend to bring their conduct into harmony with the law of Christ. In other words preaching has a twofold object—instruction and exhortation. This should be clear to every member of a Christian congregation.

Secondly, it will be the hearer's duty to make a judicious selection of the preacher, or preachers, whom he will attend. If a man be under an obligation to live in accordance with the Gospel of Christ, he must be also under an obligation to seek the best help he can obtain, towards the accomplishment of that result. I admit that in some cases, any real help is difficult or impossible to find. There are hundreds of parishes in England, for example, where there is but a single clergyman, and he has to preach so often as to be virtually compelled to talk nonsense. For such a system I have no suggestion to offer, except that it should be changed. But I am speaking now to those who live in London; and here, at any rate, there is no excuse for the man who persistently listens to sermons by which he is unmoved. He must be very singularly constituted, unless the metropolis contains one or two preachers at least, from whom he might receive some help. It is to me a marvellous and inexplicable thing, that people will go Sunday after Sunday to hear the same clergyman, and invariably grumble at his sermon. They knew quite well before they went, that they would find fault when they came away. Then why, in the name of common sense, were they there? They are not compelled to hear sermons the only effect of which is, to spoil their temper. Nay, I will go further, they ought not to hear them.

Now the kind of preaching that a man needs, will depend very much upon his education, disposition and other such circumstances. Last Sunday I pointed out certain general qualities by which all preaching must be characterised, if it is ever to do good to anybody. But you must remember that though, in these general respects, all successful preachers will be alike, they will still be distinguished from one another by much diversity of style. And this diversity will correspond—more or less—to the requirements of different kinds of hearers. For instance, there is the question of taste. Persons of culture are not likely to be benefited by a preacher who drops his h's and speaks ungrammatically, although he may be extremely earnest and clever, capable of doing much good to those who would not notice his little peculiarities of diction. And, conversely, a preacher may be too cultured to deal very successfully with the lowest classes. They prefer to listen to a speaker who is more manifestly one of themselves, and who gives them rougher and more striking illustrations than would be tolerated in Belgravia.

And there is another and more important difference between hearers, namely a difference in mental constitution. "All men do not take in moral teaching by the same sides of the mind." There is a class of hearers that will never be led except through their reason. But another and still larger class is mainly influenced through the emotions. Now, I have said that preaching implies instruction and exhortation. Well, the first class of hearers require little more than instruction. If you prove to them by reasoning the legitimacy of certain beliefs, they will accept them, and ever afterwards act in accordance with them. If you show them the reasonableness of certain conduct, you have done all that is necessary. It needs little or no exhortation to make them act in harmony with the dictates of reason. Others, on the contrary, in whom the intellect is weaker and the emotions stronger, require very little argument. They will believe, or imagine they believe, almost anything that you tell them. But these abstract beliefs do not much influence their conduct. That is chiefly governed by emotions. And so, what they require is mainly exhortative.

Now you may say it is our duty to address ourselves in the course of our ministry, and even in the course of every sermon, to both these classes. I admit it. But you must not expect too much from preachers. And if you do expect it you won't get it. The natural bent of a

preacher, just like that of a hearer, is either intellectual or emotional. He cannot change his nature, nor would it be desirable for him to do so if he could. He will accomplish the best work for God when he is truest to the nature God has given him. If persons to whom he is not adapted will persist in hearing him, it is *not his* fault, but *theirs*, if they get no good. Nothing can be more undesirable than for those whose bent is mainly intellectual to listen regularly to a preacher who is nearly always emotional, or for those who are chiefly influenced by their emotions to hear nothing but sermons which are for the most part intellectual. The natural bent of preacher and hearer should correspond.

And, in addition to these broad differences, there are many others, which I need not now enumerate, slighter, but still of importance as determining and restricting the kinds of hearers, whom alone any particular clergyman is likely to benefit. There is no preacher in the world adapted to everybody. A sermon may be useless to one man, and yet, or I may say and therefore, specially adapted to another whose requirements are totally different. It is with sermons as with books. You may have outgrown an author, and he may now be beneath you. But on the contrary it is possible that you may not like him because he is above you, and moves in an atmosphere in which you cannot comfortably breathe. The fact, then, that you do not care for the preacher whom you are accustomed to hear, is no argument whatever against *him*, but it is a very strong argument against *you*. If you had done your duty, you would have found some one else from whom there was at least a chance of your receiving good. In he selection of your preachers, as in every other sphere of life, you need common sense and moral earnestness.

There is a third requisite necessary for the proper hearing of the Gospel, namely, a spirit of humility. The congregation should be possessed by a desire for spiritual help, and they should also feel that there is some likelihood of their getting it. This spirit of humility is remarkable for its absence in a very large number of church-goers. There are many persons much more anxious to teach the clergyman than desirous that he should teach them. Disregard for the opinions of the minister, though common enough in the English Church, is, if possible, more flagrant among Dissenters. I dare say you remember how well this is described in Mrs. Oliphant's "Salem Chapel." There is another less known but equally interesting book, called "Frederick Rivers," written under the *nom de plume* of Mrs. Williamson. It is really the autobiography of William Kirkus, who was at one time an independent minister, but afterwards joined the Establishment. He describes in a very amusing manner how his deacons were always sitting in judgment on him and finding fault with him. And in particular he relates how on a certain occasion one of them, named Bung, came into the vestry and said: "I have heard it rumoured, Mr. Kirkus, that you read the works of Frederick Maurice." "Certainly," said the minister, "rumour is correct. I do. Why shouldn't I?" The deacon replied: "Because Maurice is an infidel." "Indeed," said Mr. Kinkus, "is he? who told you so?" "Well," replied Mr. Bung, rather driven into a corner by this cross-examination, "Mrs. Bung told me." So because Mrs. Bung told Mr. Bung that Maurice was an infidel, therefore the minister must not read him. In the Church of England there is more outward show of respect for clergymen, but behind their backs criticisms are often made that are little less absurd.

Those, however,—both Churchmen and Dissenters,—who have taken pains to find out the preacher or preachers adapted to their requirements, will generally be characterised by a spirit of humility. And when I say that hearers should possess this spirit, you will please understand that I do not mean to claim for clergymen anything miraculous or supernatural. I should be the last man in the world to assume priestly superiority over the humblest member of my congregation. All I mean is this. If a clergyman has devoted the greater part of his life to the study of subjects connected with his vocation, there is certainly a presumption that he will know more about them than his hearers, who have devoted their lives to other pursuits. However great his ignorance, and however liable he may be to error, his ignorance and his liability to error must be less than theirs, in regard to subjects which he has studied more. At any rate, if they think not, why do they sit and listen to him? What would you say of a patient who never took the doctor's medicine, but only criticised his prescriptions? You would say, Why on earth does the man have a doctor? Now there are many church-goers who, as they think, know all about everything. They could teach the clergyman a great deal, but he can teach them nothing. Then why do they have a clergyman? It does not cost them much. But still, little as it is, it is a waste of money—not to speak of the waste of time. No doubt the preacher may make mistakes, and therefore his opinions should not be blindly accepted. But if you do not think them worthy of consideration, it can be nothing but the rankest hypocrisy which causes you to sit and hear them.

I think it cannot be doubted that there are in every church a great number of these hypocritical hearers, men and women who come, not intending to listen, and never dreaming of being helped. The only thing they like about a sermon is the end, and the preacher's sole business according to them is to get through with it. If, during paroxysms of coughing or any other interruption, he

pauses till he can again be heard, they are astonished. Why should he want to be heard? Why should he waste those precious seconds in which he might have been bringing his sermon to a close? This kind of hearer moreover wants the sermon to proceed, not only fast, but smoothly, so that he is not obliged to listen. He has a great dislike to being what he calls "startled." And the preacher who has the power of compelling him to listen and forcing him to think, will be regarded by him with the greatest repugnance. Mr. Perrin, in his comparison of Christianity and Buddhism, has the following suggestive passage: "The laxity of thought in religion, which is so prominent a feature in the Christian world, has its counterpart in the greatest religion of the East. The Buddhist monks of Siam do not, as a rule, endeavour to make their sermons interesting, or even intelligible. They are satisfied with monotonously chanting or intoning a number of verses in the dead language Pali, to which they add an almost incomprehensible commentary in Siamese. Nor do their hearers care. Crouching on the ground in a reverential posture, they acquire merit as they think by appearing to listen, and they do not believe that that merit would be one whit greater if they understood the language of the preacher. It certainly would not require much imagination to establish a resemblance between such devotion and that which distinguishes many Christian congregations."

To sum up this part of my subject:—From every member of a Christian congregation is required (1.) a clear understanding of the meaning and use of sermons; (2.) an honest endeavour to discover the preacher, or preachers, best fitted to minister to his own personal requirements; and (3.) a spirit of genuine humility, that is to say, a consciousness of deficiency and a sincere desire for help.

Before closing I should like to say a word or two about the influence which hearers may exert over those who preach to them. I pointed out to you last Sunday, how much society had done to the prejudice of preaching, by laying down all sorts of foolish rules and conventionalities, the tendency of which is to render sermons insipid and monotonous. But now let me ask you to notice the power which the individual hearer possesses over the individual preacher. In the first place, as he sits there in the pew he contributes something to the success or failure of the sermon. Every discourse is as much the production of the audience as it is of the man who delivers it. I have preached the same sermon on consecutive Sundays to different audiences, and in the one case, where the congregation was sympathetic and interested, I felt that I was preaching well, or at any rate that I was doing my best; in the other case, where the congregation was antagonistic, or—worse still—indifferent, I felt that I was preaching so badly it would have been better for me to have stayed at home. Only those of you who are accustomed to public speaking will be aware how depressing it is to address an audience that takes no interest in what you say. Every one, therefore, whose presence would be likely to damp the enthusiasm of the preacher will best do his duty by absenting himself.

Secondly, I have a remark to make in regard to criticism. Now there are two kinds of criticism, one of which is useless and injurious, while the other is of the utmost value. The first kind I may call captious criticism. It is what is vulgarly designated as "picking holes," that is finding faults, or rather making them, where they do not actually exist. You will hear people, for example, condemning a sermon because the preacher wore a coloured stole or a black gown; because he said—or did not say—the invocation at the beginning of it; because he turned—or did not turn—to the East at the end of it; or abusing it on account of a hundred and fifty other irrelevant trivialities. After the Archbishop preached last year at the festival service of the Temple Church, I made some inquiries as to the subject of his sermon. But I could discover very little about it. All I learnt for certain was this; the benchers had been furious because he began without a text! There is no other public speaker in the world, who is subjected to the same puerile, and—the word is not classical, but there is no classical word to express anything so contemptible—*pottering*, criticism which is every Sunday lavished on the preacher. When it comes to his ears it may annoy, or sadden, or merely amuse him. In any case, however, it is morally injurious, like every other kind of pettiness, to the man who is guilty of it.

But there is a kind of criticism which is of great use. The two varieties of criticism are distinguished very well by the Rev. Phillips Brooks in his "Lectures on Preaching": "One difficulty of the preacher's office is its subjection to flippant gossip, along with its exemption from severe and healthy criticism. There are people enough always to find out a minister's little faults, and let him hear of them; but it is wonderful how he can go on year after year, without being once brought up to the judgment seat of sound intelligence, and hearing what is the real worth of the words that he is saying, and the work that he is doing." Personally, I must say, I have been very fortunate in receiving a good deal of useful criticism; and to those who have given it I owe a debt of gratitude which I shall never be able to repay. Just let me point out to you one or two instances of the sort of criticism which might with great advantage be offered to a preacher. He may have little tricks of manner, little oddities of style, which are offensive and distracting, and which really tend to make his best sermons ineffective. If so, by all means tell him of them. Again, you

may think that the arguments which he has advanced on a given subject are weak and insufficient. Then it will be a kindness to inform him of the fact,—more especially if you are able to suggest anything by which his position could be strengthened. Or, again, he may have helped you; you may be at this moment wiser, better, happier, a different kind of being altogether to that which, but for him, you would have been. If so, do not hesitate to thank him. It will be his best reward and his strongest stimulus.

Now I trust that the few simple suggestions I have offered will enable you to see the kind of preaching and the kind of hearing which the Gospel deserves and requires. When we have such preaching and such hearing as that which I have endeavoured to describe,—then, and not till then, will the Church be really prosperous; then, and not till then, will the world at large begin to feel that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation; then, and not till then, will men perceive the infinite beauty of the old, old story that is ever new, and the infinite significance of the old, old truths that are ever capable of fresh expansion and development; then, and not till then, will the Saviour's prophecy be fulfilled:—"I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

## "TWO PICTURES."

FROM A WORK BY JULIUS DAMMANN, EVANGELICAL CLERGYMAN, ENTITLED "THE FIRST AND LAST LEAF OF THE BIBLE; OR, CREATION AND SALVATION." REPUBLISHED IN THE "POMMERANIAN HOUSE-FRIEND" OF DECEMBER, 1885.

TRANSLATED BY REV. CANON COURTENAY MOORE, M.A. RECTOR OF MITCHELSTOWN, DIOCESE OF CLOYNE, MEMBER OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

TEN years ago there died in Ludwigsburg, David Frederick Strauss, a celebrated theological and philosophical writer. He was one of the most acute and violent adversaries of the Christianity revealed in the Bible. Upon Holy Scripture he had exercised a merciless criticism, and of the Bible he had left not much more than the two covers. There is no God, Who at any time, in any way, had revealed Himself to men, and in Whose strength wonders had been done. Therefore all that the Bible relates from the first to the last leaf, rests upon delusion, fancy, pious sayings and legends.

The whole life of Jesus melts together into a miserable remnant. According to Strauss it is only certain that he was bred in Nazareth, that he had allowed John to baptize him; that he had assembled around himself disciples, and went about teaching in Palestine (literally Jewish country), that he everywhere opposed himself to self-righteous Pharisees and scribes, sunk in formalism. But in the end he paid for the hatred and envy of the Pharisaical party and died on the cross.

A few words of Jesus may still be certain. All the rest pious report has invented later on. His Incarnation, His miracles and prophecies, His atoning death on the Cross; His resurrection and ascension; His sitting on the right hand of God; His second coming—all this the sharp knife of this critic has cut away from the tree of Christian faith. Well, the man is consistent, and does not remain standing half way. There are so-called Christians who do the same as Strauss has done; only they wish to still remain Christians. Strauss has to the question "Are we still Christians" given the conclusive answer, "No, we are no longer Christians. We know no God external to the world, and therefore also no God-man Jesus Christ."

Immortality, Judgment, Resurrection, Eternal Life are rejected things. Everyone therefore must understand his position as well as he can in this life, and seek to accommodate himself to it.

But yet man must have something more to comfort him and raise him up in the misery of this life, so Strauss recommends to poor humanity, in place of its destroyed belief—listen and wonder!—music, the theatre, concerts, paintings, classical literature; also Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, &c., &c. O! you poor, uneducated, sick, infirm, crippled, lame, blind, tempted, dying ones, what will you do with this receipt? Strauss means himself; he whom he cannot help with it must go back to Moses and the prophets.

This Strauss had a long and painful sick-bed confinement. He saw his end approach with Stoical calm; and what was it which occupied this atheist just shortly before his death? The question of the immortality of the soul! One would have thought he would have got clear about this. Had he not often written that it (immortality) was nothing, nothing at all?

On the day before his death, he let them give him a work, which Plato the Greek philosopher (who died 384 years before the birth of Christ), had written on the immortality of the soul. He read the book in the original once more, and laid it out of his hands with these words, "Overthrown point of view"! After this he died and went to his place. Certainly Plato's little book on the immortality of the soul is an "overthrown point of view." As gloriously as this Greek philosopher and heathen knows to speak of it, that our soul will not pass away because it is appointed for a noble place by a good God, and will enter a divine immortality where its portion will be to be happy. When Christ came with His sayings, His death, His resurrection, *then* was Plato vanquished; Strauss has not overcome death, he has in fear of death remained a slave. One can meet death with stoical calm; one can in apathetic frame and sentiment sink in the arms of unavoidable death; one can, overcome by bodily pain, even long for death—but one has not thereby overcome death. One can to the last breath cling to the hope of not dying, but he has not thereby conquered death. One can in fever-heat and unconciousness pass into darkness; he has not thereby conquered death. And what shall one first say of those; such as cannot imagine death without an inner feeling of horror at the idea. We have no need to think of it yet, that is their comfort. He who is seventy years of age thinks of eighty years; and he who is eighty thinks of ninety; and he who is ninety thinks of yet another year. It is related of the ostrich (this is a play upon Strauss's name, strauss being the German for ostrich), that if it is pursued it sticks its head in the sand of the desert, then it sees not its

enemies, and no longer believes they are there. In like manner men without number veil the face of their soul before death pursuing them, and put every anxious thought of death out of the way. What folly to wish to put that out of the way with which you must inevitably come in contact. This is, as the Scripture says, to be a slave in fear of death all your life long.

Christ has taken away the power of death, and He only. In Him we overcome it. He puts the triumph song in the pallid lips: "Death where is thy sting?" Death come here, I fear thee not. The life which He gives breaks victorious through the dark valley of death. He takes the sting from death when He takes the sins from our souls. Reconcile thyself with thy God; to know that, is to have a soft death-pillow. It is appointed unto men once to die and after that the judgment. Men may say what they like about what it is which makes death so uncomfortable and full of horror. Only the living faith in Christ who has satisfied for my sins; by whose blood I have become clean from all sin; who has clothed me with His righteousness; who through His resurrection warrants my resurrection, only this faith overcomes with victorious strength the horrible majesty of death.

The deathbeds of believing Christians are the striking proof of Christianity.

I wished to show two pictures; here is the other.

A trustworthy clergyman says, "A lady died in my parish a few years ago, whose life I can trace from the beginning. She lived in comfort, even in affluence. Afterwards storms of tribulation broke in, one after another. She lost all her property and was reduced to poverty; she lost all her loved ones, who had sweetened her anxious existence. In her comfortless solitude she fell sick of a disease of the most terrible kind from which one can suffer. She had nothing else to expect in future, than an increase of her sufferings and a death full of torture. One day I went into her poor cottage, with a heart grieved beforehand at the thought of such a host of afflictions crowded together to a head. I found her eyes wet from fresh flowing tears, which she in vain sought to hide from me. Prepared for a new report of suffering, I said, What has again befallen you, dear friend? whereupon she answered, "I weep not for sorrow but for joy, for I was thinking of my Saviour," and this inner blissful joy remained with her until her last end. She was the most suffering creature whom I had learned to know during a ministry of forty years."

O you philosophers and natural scientists, you professors and doctors, you cultivated and enlightened, with your superior smiles over the obsolete Bible-faith; with your protests against the God-man Jesus Christ, whose Cross is foolishness and an offence to you. You, Edward von Hartmann with your dynamite; you, David Frederick Strauss, with your "overthrown point of view," with Goethe in one hand and Schiller in the other! I pray you come into this cottage, come to this bed of suffering; gaze on this face gnawed by cancer, hear these words "I wept for joy, because I was thinking of my Saviour." Call it fanaticism; call it excessive sentiment; call it what you will; you must bow yourselves against your inclination, before the name of the God-man, who can give a human soul such conquering power in such a case. Here is certain salvation from the wicked, wretched world; on this pain-stricken countenance shines the morning twilight of another world. Here is the proof of the truth of the words, "I am come that you might have life and have it more abundantly."

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1886.

## GERMAN LITERATURE: A POLITICAL PARABLE.

A SHORT time since we published an article in the PULPIT on the study of German, and we now propose to supplement it by giving our readers "a taste of the quality" of a German author of the present century—Heinrich Heine by name. Heine was born on the 13th of December, 1799. He poetically says of himself: "About my cradle played the last moonbeams of the eighteenth and the first morning twilight of the nineteenth century." He studied law at the University of Göttingen, and lived as an author in Paris until his death in February, 1855. As a writer he is full of spirit, wit, and jest, and was uncommonly gifted as a lyrical poet. "Heine for songs"—so Browning speaks of him. The following is a prose translation of one of his satirical political poems. It might be called the Progress of Radicalism, which progress he points out with amazing wit, though he considers all proposed remedies quite inefficient to check it. His own title for the poem is "The Wandering Rats," under which figure he describes the Radicals. He identifies the two with a pun, thus —"Ganz radikal, ganz rattenkahl."

In the present state of English society it seems to us that this poem will be very acceptable to some of our readers, as descriptive of the times:—

### THE WANDERING RATS.

There are two kinds of rats—the hungry and the satisfiedr The latter remain at home happy, but the hungry wande. about. They wander many thousand miles, quite without rest or leisure, straight ahead in their stern course; neither wind nor weather stops them. They climb well over the heights, they swim well through the seas. Though many a one is drowned or breaks his neck, the living leave the dead behind. These strange little fellows have fearful snouts; they have their heads equally shaven, quite from the root—quite bald like a rat. This radical mob knows nothing of a God. They do not baptize their children; their wives are common property. This sensual rat rabble will only eat and drink; it reflects not, while it eats and drinks, that our soul is immortal. And so a wild rat, which fears neither hell nor cat, and which has no goods, no money, wishes to divide the world afresh. These wandering rats, O woe! They are already in the neighbourhood; they march down; I already hear their screaming; their number is legion. O woe! We are lost! They are already before the doors.

The Burgomaster and the Senate they shake their heads, and no one knows counsel. The burger-band grasps its arms; the priests ring the bells; the Palladium, the possession of public morals, is in peril. But neither bell-ringing nor priests' prayers, nor very wise Senate degrees, nor cannons—many hundred pounders—help you to-day, you dear children. To-day, also, word-spinning will not help you—the worn-out art of talking. *One does not catch rats with syllogisms;* they spring over the finest sophisms. To hungry stomachs there find entrance only soup-logic with dumpling foundation; only arguments of roast beef accompanied by Göttingen sausages. A dumb codfish fried in butter pleases the radical rabble much better than a Mirabeau and all orators since Cicero.

We make a few comments upon this parable. As already mentioned, it points out the danger but suggests no remedy. Heine is a poet, not a politician. It is quite out of the question that idle vagrants and paid agitators are to be kept quiet with supplies of "soup-logic" and "arguments of roast beef." These supplies are not inexhaustible. And besides, "If any man will not work neither let him eat." If it be true that "one does not catch rats with syllogisms," they must be caught with something else—with traps, for example. Heine, like John Bright, seems to think "force no remedy"—"not even cannon, many hundred pounders, help you to-day." Indeed! "The whiff of grape-shot" has been found at times wonderfully efficacious; and likewise the process which Carlyle calls sweeping the streets with a steel besom. We suppose Mr. Gladstone will continue to believe that *he can catch rats with syllogisms*, and there is every prospect that he will go on providing "arguments of roast beef" out of any property still remaining to English landlords and Irish loyalists. It is true that, although the Home Secretary has announced that he is prepared to turn over the Irish Constabulary to the control of the Home Rulers in Ireland, he has not as yet, like the Chief Secretary for Ireland, declared that he will exercise a dispensing power with reference to the legal rights of people resident in England. Mr. Parnell is quite prepared to give any guarantee for the preservation of our lives, liberty, and property under the new *régime*, should it come in; but we feel inclined to say of the Parnellites, in the words quoted above of the rats—"They spring over the finest sophisms." How easily an Irish farmer takes the fence of a judicial rent! A year or two ago his cry was a fixed judicial rent for fifteen years. Now it is 20 per cent. off that; the judicial rent of to-day is the rack-rent of to-morrow.

"Neither bell-ringing nor priests' prayers help you to-day." There are indications that the Irish rats are getting, or have got beyond such means of control. Witness the Curtin case in Kerry, and the suspension of the celebration of Mass for six weeks by the Bishop in the parish of Firies. The Irish Roman priests are now playing a terribly dangerous game; as a body they have thrown in their lot with the Fenians and the Land League; they have sown the wind, and may expect to reap the whirlwind. Truly we may say, "the Palladium is in peril"—viz., "the possession of public morals."

In "Essays and Leaves from a Note-Book," by the late George Eliot, there is a very interesting essay on German wit: Heinrich Heine. That gifted writer speaks of him thus:—

Whatever else he may be, Heine is one of the most remarkable men of this age: a surpassing lyric poet, who has uttered our feelings for us in delicious song; a humorist who touches leaden folly with the magic wand of his fancy, and transmutes it into the fine gold of art; who sheds his sunny smile on human tears, and makes them a beauteous rainbow on the cloudy background of life; a wit who holds in his mighty hand the most scorching lightnings of satire; an artist in prose literature who has shown even more completely than Göethe the possibilities of German prose; and, in spite of all charges against him—true as well as false—a lover of freedom who has spoken wise and brave words on behalf of his fellow men.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### THE IRISH AND BRITISH QUESTION.

SIR,—Does it really render a man unfit to form a judgment on the Irish Question that he does not inhabit Ireland, and has little to do with the local controversies of the hour? I doubt it. In the course of my life, and, in particular, of the thirteen years during which I held a Paris chaplaincy, I have known intimately many Irish gentlemen — the majority of them Protestants, but some Roman Catholics also. In all, I have found, without exception, a latent feeling of discontent, that Ireland was treated as an appendage to the larger island, a feeling sometimes bitterly expressed. The great Irish marks, the strength of the family affections and liveliness of wit, I have found in almost all, combined with an outspoken habit of mind, contrasting much with English yea-and-nayishness. But, to pass to more serious matters.

I am asked to consider whether England, Scotland, or Ireland would approve of a process of disintegration. I know of none. I have never suggested three "Parliaments." I have always said there can be one Parliament only, holding alone the power of the purse, to which alone the National Budget can be submitted, ruling and administering the United Kingdom and the Empire. What is proposed is, that local legislation for the three countries should, *in the first place*, be submitted to six local chambers, sitting for two months each, and preparing for a four months' session of the Imperial Parliament. It is most important, to my eyes, to use the expression "local chambers," and far better and wiser to talk of local legislation than of "home rule." The Queen rules, and the Imperial Parliament under her. Local chambers, on the other hand, may carry forward local legislation, with the clear understanding that they must go to Parliament for every penny of Imperial money. I would give to each country the right to make its own fiscal regulations as to the imposition of duties on all foreign goods, and other home arrangements.

I am very strongly of opinion that the modification thus proposed would not only not tend to "disintegrate," but would, on the contrary, make the ties of union far stronger than at present. It is true that Dublin and Edinburgh would be secondary capitals, but I see no injury wrought thereby to Irishmen or Scotchmen ; rather a serious and important gain.

The conclusive answer to the alarming objections raised by Irishmen in your columns, seems to be that the Upper Chamber would be a strongly Conservative body, consisting of *all* Irish peers, certain great officials, twelve Roman Catholic and eight Anglican Bishops, and four representatives of Northern Presbyterianism. As for the suggestion that Roman Catholics would endeavour to confiscate this or that, there is a famous utterance in an Irish masterpiece, "The Vicar of Wakefield," which seems to me best suited to the occasion,—"Fudge!" The same expressive word is highly applicable also to the threats of civil war, and fierce assurances that peace and order never, never shall be accepted. I have no doubt Orangemen would make a splendid fight in case of need. Luckily there is no need. Love is better than hate, and good will preferable to scorn. Almost all Irishmen prefer religious to secular education. Why should they not have it? Most Irishmen (Papist or Protestant) desire to protect their native interests. Why should they not do it?

The *real* difficulty in the way of carrying out the healing process lies in England, and Scotland, and in the minds of statesmen and of press writers, who all find it difficult to contemplate any serious change in our existing system. The British Parliament has, on the whole, a noble past, and although local legislation has almost been suspended recently we all find it difficult to entertain the possibility of a modification of our present rule. Nevertheless great excesses call for sweeping remedies.

Important principles involved are (1) the consolidation of the hereditary principle. As the great body of the people are now permitted to vote, there is more absolute need than ever of a hereditary body of counsellors to prevent the supremacy of the one majority of the hour. In all these upper local chambers, the peers (1) of England and Wales, (2) of Scotland, (3) of Ireland, would sit and legislate.

II. The second important principle involved in six local chambers under the Imperial Parliament is that the Churches should be directly represented in the Upper Chambers. I say the Churches, not the Church. As an English churchman, I am attached to the existing alliance of Church and State, as a widening and enlarging influence, but that is no reason, to my mind, why other Churches, Presbyterian and Roman Catholic, etc., should not be represented in the local upper chambers, and in Parliament also. For the present, I have to deal with the question of local chambers only. In the London Upper Chamber, I should like to see the President of the Wesleyan Conference, and other representatives of Protestant Nonconformity, and one or two Roman Catholic as well as, say, twelve Anglican Bishops. In the Edinburgh Upper Chamber the different Presbyterian bodies, Episcopalians, and Roman Catholics, should all be represented. In the Dublin, as has been especially stated, twelve Roman Catholic Bishops, eight Anglican, and four representatives of Northern Presbyterianism, should sit in council with all the Irish Peers. This would call forth the best and most Conservative elements of all the Churches, and work towards true Catholic reunion in God's own time and way.

The same Bishop of Peterborough, who has prepared (with excellent intention, doubtless) a bill for stripping the unendowed clergy practically of their incomes by substituting a self-willed process of charitable donations for honest *payments* for benefits received, has also hazarded in Convocation a very unhappy reference to the supposed impossibility of gathering the sects into the Church. I am obliged to note that this irreconcileable and rather hasty legislator is an Irishman. "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God." I am afraid it will be some time before a true Milesian lays claim to this blessing, ay, or an Anglo-Irishman either !

As to the query whether I propose "Parliaments for the Isles of Man, Jersey, Guernsey, etc.," these, as a matter of fact, do exist ! I have already stated why Wales and England must be one, because Wales is the parent stock. Wales is the parent tree of Britain.

Finally, the thing will be done, and, as I believe, must be done. Nationalist and loyalist organs of opinion in Ireland, the *Freeman's Journal*, the *Daily Express*, etc., welcome local chambers under Parliament and the Crown as a simple matter of fact. First and foremost, Mr. Parnell does so himself, and has shown this repeatedly of late in more ways than one. The alternative would be martial law and civil war. Can reasonable men prefer it?

Local chambers in Dublin would mean a total cessation of agitation, establishment of good will between landlords and tenants, payment of rents, and collapse of expropriation. Would not these be real benefits? Even Irish American republicans would be silenced and put to shame.

It is possible to hark back to old violent speeches and bitter memories, and good and honest men will do so for a time, but peace and truth must prevail before long, if local chambers be conceded.

Whether Liberals or Conservatives carry out this healing policy is a matter of comparative indifference. Things, not names, must be our motto ; measures, not men. I by no means despair of common action on the part of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury in this matter. May I hope that your correspondents will not repeat too bitterly, "I do well to be angry," with the prophet Jonah. It is clear, commerce can not revive in Ireland, confidence cannot be restored, without some measure of local legislation. We have to make it innocuous, nay, helpful. All Britain suffers through Ireland. The essential is that whatever local legislation be conceded to Ireland should be granted to the two sister countries. Then, under the ægis of Parliament and the Crown, "Tria juncta in uno" would be our motto indeed, and our national palladium.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
February 20, 1886.

---

SIR,—In my letter inserted in your last issue, I considered the Irish Question as it affects Irish loyalists. I stated my opinion that if Home Rule be conceded, it must meet the ideas, not of England, but of Ireland, or it cannot be of any avail to check further agitation, and I added that such concession would virtually mean the ruin, and possibly the extermination of Irish loyalists ; surely it is inconsistent with the honour of a great people, who have always been the

champions of the weak against the strong, to act in the manner described by Bulwer Lytton—"There was a hypocritical Quaker once, who said to his enemy, 'I can't shed thy blood, friend, but I will hold thy head under water till thou art drowned.'"—To tie Ulster hand and foot and hand it over to the Land League, would be a curious return from England, for loyalty that has never failed, though no man can say that it was ever encouraged. But there is another aspect of the Home Rule question—its Imperial side: When we have an Irish Parliament, are our members to sit in an imperial legislature? If so, how can they be prevented from bringing about a deadlock similar to the present one? But if they be excluded, while the Imperial Legislature taxes this country for Imperial purposes, then Ireland will be taxed, yet have no voice in assessing the scale of taxation.

Would Mr. Gurney give an Irish Parliament a responsible ministry dependent on the Irish vote and responsible to the Irish people? If not, we would have the old state of things over again, when English statesmen, to secure party triumphs, corrupted Irish political life to an extent rarely equalled, never surpassed in history. Corruption, agitation, and sham patriotism would revel under the new *régime*.

To give Ireland absolute power over the Irish Ministry, reserving a veto to the Imperial Cabinet, would only make confusion more confounded. If the local authorities had not control of the police, no taxes would be paid, and if they had, no taxes could be levied, for they would not allow the police to act; and thus, the Empire and the Home Government would be at open feud. The same thing would happen in the case of rents, whether payable to landlords or Government. England has, for a long time, paid black mail to murderers and traitors, under the delusion that she could appease Irish disaffection, and it is there to-day as bitter as ever, and now terrified by obstruction and dynamite, she enters into close alliance with men once imprisoned as traitors, and she legalises and strengthens an organisation denounced by the late Mr. P. J. Smyth, a Nationalist and Romanist, as "the League of Hell." English policy as represented by Mr. Gladstone has been this—"Only ring the chapel bell loud enough and ply the trade of outrage merrily enough and you must get anything, from a slice of the landlord's rental up to a Parliament in College Green."

And of course the bell has been rung! Well, when Home Rule has been conceded, other measures will suit the emergency, and the bell will cease to be rung. Then, with the control of the Irish Constabulary, the finest force in the world, as the nucleus of a standing army, the Irish Parliament, by adopting the short service system, can train every man in the use of arms, and every forge in the country can be used as a manufactory for pikes. Cork or Galway would soon become a Gibraltar for Russia or America. But suppose an ordinary case to arise like the following. If England should go to war with a power friendly to Ireland, how would the question of war supplies—men—ships—money—provisions—be adjusted? Let us suppose an Irish Parliament determined to abolish rents; would England stand looking on while property was confiscated, whose confiscation would imply the robbery of English and Scottish companies to the extent of millions of money? If the supreme Government continued to veto measure after measure, where would be the independence of Ireland? In 1782 Grattan secured Legislative Independence, and your readers can judge how much this country gained by that measure when I mention that while Grattan and his friends amused themselves in College Green by wrangling about the Regency Bill, the whole country was torn by strife and feuds. White Boys and Right Boys, and Defenders, and Peep o' Day Boys, and Orangemen, and United Irishmen enjoyed themselves in the provinces, and Dublin was the scene of soldier houghing, and tarring and feathering, until the whole ended in a *saturnalia* of horrors in the Rebellion of '98. Of course the country has changed since then, but who that has read our local newspapers during recent years can fail to perceive that religious rancour and class hatred still exist to an extent that Englishmen can literally form no conception of? I have written against Home Rule mainly from the religious side, because this point was insisted upon by Mr. Gurney when he laid stress on the necessity of conciliating the Churches, but as a matter of fact educated Roman Catholics with property to lose are opposed to Home Rule, and are accordingly hated by the Parnellites with a deadly hatred. The mere fact that when Home Rule seemed imminent a few months since, Bank of Ireland stock went down in a few days £50 or £60 a share, should teach Englishmen what Irish merchants and business men expect from the new departure. I am sorry to have trespassed so much on your space, and I would much prefer that some one better qualified to deal with the subject than I am had replied to Mr. Gurney, but if his letters had passed unchallenged, he and others might possibly think that we in Ireland had changed our views with regard to the men described by an English statesman as "steeped in treason to the lips."

THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.

The Vicarage, Warrenpoint.

## HOME RULE.

SIR,—There will be no civil war in Ireland about Home Rule. If it is granted, England will not stand by quietly and let Ulster and the other three Provinces fight about it; and this being so, Ulster can't single-handed fight the other provinces backed by England. It is wicked nonsense to talk of war under such circumstances—Orangemen are just as intolerant as Ultramontanes. Cursing the Pope and eating meat on Friday, have been described as two of the chief articles of their belief.

AN ULSTERMAN.

## THE DEMONS AND THE SWINE.

SIR,—Kindly allow me to express my thanks to "Presbyter" for his very able and interesting letter in reply to my queries on the above subject. I need hardly assure him that I should be very sorry to classify him with the cock-sure critics. In connection with them I always think of a couplet which I heard in my University days—

> They can throw out and smatter
> And miss the matter.

By the way, sir, how much do you expect Bishop King's "ridiculous mitre" ("still harping on my daughter") would fetch if sold for the benefit of the poorer clergy of the diocese of Lincoln? Why not throw in the Pastoral Staff? You really do a great

injustice to the Deans. Look at the literary work done by the present Deans of Wells, Chichester, and Norwich. To quote "Presbyter's" adjective, it is quite in the "slashing" style to speak of the "absolute uselessness of Deaneries."

M.

## CHURCH PATRONAGE AND PEWS.

SIR,—There are at present two legislative projects concerning church affairs before the public, both of which are entitled to attention. One of these is the plan for dealing with patronage and the sale of advowsons, which is understood to be under the consideration of the new House of Laymen of the province of Canterbury. It divides itself into two parts. That which will probably be regarded as the more important of the two, is the authorization of Boards of Patronage to which advowsons may be sold. It is thus simply an enabling provision; and if the constitution of the proposed Boards be unobjectionable, the plan is not only unobjectionable, but may reasonably be expected to be of benefit.

The other half of the project is of a different nature. It is proposed to prohibit the sale of next presentations, as the sale of presentations to vacancies is now prohibited. I desire to state the objections to this proposal; and I do not conceal, that they apply, both to it, and to the present prohibition of the sale of presentations to vacancies.

If an advowson be property, it must be subject to the conditions of property; it must be saleable and purchaseable. It is unreasonable, and it is founded upon no real distinction, that what is saleable in its whole should not be saleable in its parts. If it be presumed, that the purchaser will make a bad use of what he purchases, by appointing a bad man to the cure of souls; it is as presumable, that the seller will do likewise. The objection is to the existence of patronage at all. The bishop has what power belongs to him by law to interfere against presentation and institution of an improper clerk. What this power is, and what it ought to be, are not questions connected with the existence of patronage, or with the terms on which patronage should be exercised.

The prohibition of the sale of a presentation to a vacant living can be easily evaded, and is, as I believe, evaded pretty frequently; chiefly through means of exchanges of livings. It is a moral and social evil that a law should prevail which is not by any means that I know of capable of general enforcement, and is from its nature susceptible of being, when there is a disposition, constantly evaded.

The transaction, when direct, is called simony. I cannot see that it is any more of the nature of simony to buy or sell a vacancy *in esse* than one *in futuro*. I cannot see that either is simoniacal at all. If a candidate for orders should bribe a bishop to ordain him, that bears plain likeness to the offer of money by the Samaritan sorcerer to Peter; but for a man who has a place to bestow, the right of bestowing which is by law property, to traffic in its bestowal is, neither in his act nor in the act of the man who traffics with him, simony, by any but a very strained if not quite unwarrantable construction.

My contention is that traffic in presentations is inseparable from the existence of private patronage. And my belief is, that what mischief may be caused by this traffic prevailing is very far out-weighed by the benefits to the political society, and still more by the benefits to the Christian society, of England, of our manifold system of patronage, whereof lay patronage is a large part.

The other legislative scheme, now brought forward, is a Bill, in the House of Lords, promoted by the Bishop of Peterborough, which designs to extinguish all private pew-rights in all churches, which rights have not been created by Acts of Parliament; to extinguish, in fact, all common-law and prescriptive rights in sittings in churches. There are many persons who will perceive on the mere statement that this is essentially and utterly unjust, and of the nature of confiscation. Were it however justifiable, it cannot possibly be expedient. I doubt if it be possible to conceive a project that would and must, if effected, produce a larger cup of bitter, unprofitable, and mischievous strifes; and they would be none the less bitter and mischievous because they would be petty. I can hardly think that the Bishop of Peterborough can have reflected on what he is doing; but there is no less reason on that account that the public should be warned.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

22nd February, 1886.

## EMIGRATION.

SIR,—In the schemes of emigration which I see put forth, whether emanating from our Church or started as recommendations from numerous correspondents in the Press, I fail to see any allusion to *places* where emigrants would be welcome, or advice to those who are *unfitted to emigrate*, or opinions as to who may *emigrate with advantage* to themselves.

1. As to places to go to. This cannot be treated only as a local question. Men with a handicraft, good workmen, and really willing to work, would do well in a peopled place, where others without these qualifications would fail, abuse the place, and return to England to discourage others. I could point from my own knowledge to many such failures. People who have never been out of England and have never taken the trouble to find out what are the needs of our colonies, are giving their opinions as though a man and his family had only to disembark in any part of North America, Australia, or New Zealand, or the Cape, and take possession of a cabin with three acres and a cow, but more probably they are promised 150 acres of fine land! This is all myth. The question of the place and where to go to, is a very much harder matter to settle than it was in years gone by.

2. Those who are unfitted to emigrate. A man would be worse than a brute if he felt no lively sympathy for the unemployed in London and many of our towns; but a man is worse than a fool, a born idiot, if he thinks that out of the thousands of the unemployed, it would be an easy matter to find a majority who would put their back into work for twelve hours out of twenty-four when they went to a Colony! Men who declare they are starving, but who will not work under sixpence an hour and refuse to work for more than eight hours, must change their minds before they cross the sea on these points; they must alter their views about piece-work and working overtime where their neighbours have the will, and the way is open. I don't say that workmen and agricultural labourers can be counted on your fingers who have turned over a new leaf when disencumbered of their

surroundings—I believe there are many cases of this; but I do say that no man who knows anything of settling in a colony would take the change of place and the change in character as necessary consequents. He would look well into the applicant's unfavourable surroundings, and judge carefully whether he had the good stuff in him which would enable him to do better elsewhere.

3. Those who ought to be encouraged to emigrate. These must be selected; taking notice of handicraft, character, age, and family. I advise young married couples, or if married those who have a few young children, *ceteris paribus*, to emigrate. The wife is often the hindrance. I could have helped, by information and introduction, several married men to emigrate, but the wives stopped it all. These women would slave day after day and endure all the hardships of depressed trade and short work, but the idea of crossing a piece of salt water seemed as abhorent as taking poison. The advice I have given is, you are not bound to please your wife; go yourself, if you have health; with God's help you will do well, and if you send back the money for your wife, there is very little doubt she will follow you.

Allow me to make a digression which really bears on emigration. I am very sorry to see Mr. Gladstone's reply to the question of a member of Parliament, "Whether the Government would set about public works for the unemployed?" It is one thing to give employment to works really required, and pay for a good day's work for value received in work done; it is another thing to go in for an un-English plan, offering sops to Cerberus as our French neighbours do as a part of their rule. I cannot think Mr. Gladstone's reply "that such public employment would stop private charity," is at all true or satisfactory, coming from the Premier of England at such a crisis. I don't believe public help would dry up if public works (which could be done with advantage to the public, and fairly carried out as to labour, and moderately paid for) were set on foot. Work so exacted and so paid for would help those who were really in want and who had a good heart for work. Besides, it would have the effect of restoring the self-respect of many trades-unionists who have combined to defraud their families and the public by their short hours and higher pay rules.

We hear on every side the same mournful tidings, "We are passing through a great crisis." We all know it, from the peer to the peasant, from the bishop to the curate. The question for the "working man" and "the friends of the working man" to consider, may be put in the drowning Scotchman's words, or in words the reverse—will the *bonâ fide* "working man" exclaim "I will be drowned and no one shall help me" or will he reverse them, "I won't be drowned, will anyone help me?" To come back from my digression. Mr. Gladstone ought to have known better the deep well of philanthropy in English hearts; but he does not. "The well is deep and he has nothing to draw with," for he has given enough examples of his ignorance of the public opinion of England. If he had guaged it he would not have returned the answer he did. Suppose, sir, that one thousand men were put on at fair wage and good hours at the works required at Tilbury, or to meet the public need, so long, so ably, so perseveringly advocated by Sir Edward Birkbeck—harbours of refuge; I put it to the best-hearted philanthropist in Lombard Street or the West End, whether he would give less to help "the crisis through which we are passing," if he knew that a few thousand men were showing their willingness to work for "fair wage for fair day's work" and thus preparing themselves to see the wrongheadness and imbecility of trades-union restrictions on labour, preparing themselves to be successful workers whether they stayed at home or went abroad as emigrants, for their own and their country's good.

We have heard much of "educating public opinion." Liberals have done much to induce the working classes of England to believe in large promises and be content with small returns. The working classes are receiving enough education in primary schools to make them more thoughtful, more so than their fathers and grandfathers. Generations before them, went out with less education to our Colonies and to America, but they started with firm determination to rough it, working hard, and living hard. We may say with confidence, the great majority of those emigants from the United Kingdom succeeded and decidedly bettered themselves. The present race of English mechanics and labourers must not be flattered into thinking that large Government aid towards emigration will ensure their success. Maurice and Kingsley set a noble example in befriending the working man, but "Parson Lot" and "Alton Locke" neither descended to flattery nor injured by deception; they left it to a later set of "working men representatives" to do this; they never advised working men, as Mr. Arch did lately, "to remove depression in trade by all combining to work eight hours a day"! It is not an easy task for the clergy to come to the front and do a national duty in "educating the working classes" to view their duty and their interests in another light; but, unless we do this, we shall fail in our duty. Emigration is an excellent outlet for a teeming population. There are many good fellows and true who could better themselves and their families thus. They must be found out, helped to choose the proper place to go to, and told bravely, truthfully, kindly, what are the essential elements of success at home, and especially abroad.

Each parish in England might help on this good work. It seems as if nothing could be done now without highly sounding titles for new societies, institutions, organisations. The clergy can do all that is needed without this. There is no "Emigration Committee" in my parish, but the work is done without any "organisation." I have kept up my knowledge of emigration, while I can bring some hard experience to help inquirers. I look out for those whom I think can better themselves by emigrating, and such needful information as they require they can have; I need not say it is freely and heartily given. I have given introductions to those who have left us. My friends have proved their friends, but their best friends have been their own honest endeavours to push ahead through the hindrances which all must meet, but which are overcome by faith and courage.

A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, Gloucestershire, February 23rd, 1886.

P.S.—I must add, I do not undervalue "organisation." In towns and large parishes where laymen can be appealed to for help, it is right and wise to enlist their valuable aid. In most parishes it would be difficult to form a committee for emigration purposes. My parish is one in which circumstances oblige me to do what can be done myself; but where-

ever laymen's co-operation can be had, I would gladly work with them. To wait in every instance until we can work by "an organisation," is to leave pressing work undone.

A. D. P.

## JUSTICE BLIND.

SIR,—Justice is represented as blind-fold, holding scales equally poised. Justice is sculptured blind-fold to convey the idea of perfect truthfulness, and her even scales emphasise this notion. I saw lately a smart reply returned by one of England's judges to the late Lord Chancellor, who proposed a device over the Judge's throne in the Admiralty Court, an anchor, or something appropriate. The "respondent" acquiesced, and suggested that the Lord Chancellor should suggest a device for the judge's throne in the Divorce Court! The reply was smart: "The Dilke case has furnished a device: a bundle of sticks falling to pieces because the bond is broken; motto, 'Divorce made easy.'" God forbid that any man should disagree with Sir Henry James, when he took a high tone and all the responsibility on himself, of not going back to a public man's early antecedents and youthful indiscretions. No Court of Justice would require such a long retrospect as twenty years in the case in question. The case was recent enough. Is there any case on record of a wife's unsworn evidence against herself being received, and the woman divorced on that plea, and no co-respondent examined? Is there any case in our memory where Justice on her throne shifted the bandage from one eye, weighted the scales, and pronounced a sentence, such as the law report shows, in the case of one of the Upper Ten Thousand.

THE BLIND GODDESS.

Given from our Palace of Justice.

[We know of no such precedent. In the case that was submitted to Our Lord of the woman taken in the very act, the co-respondent was not produced; yet our Lord's decision differed widely from that of Mr. Justice Butt.—ED.]

## THE PARLIAMENTARY OATH.

SIR,—I have been waiting anxiously to see whether any public action would be taken by way of protest against the profanation of the Parliamentary Oath, which took place in our House of Commons on January 13, which has been well described as "a direct insult to Almighty God," and which, if approved of by the nation, most certainly marks a solemn crisis in the history of England.

Is it possible that we are going to acquiesce calmly in an avowed atheist making laws for a so-called Christian Empire, and beginning his work as a legislator by an act which every true-hearted man would repudiate, and by turning into mockery that which in the eyes of all Christians is a most solemn transaction.

In a sermon entitled "The Modern Atheist," preached here in August, 1881, and favourably reviewed in your columns, I advocated the retention of the Parliamentary Oath; but I say better a thousand times abolish the Oath altogether, and every semblance of religion in our Houses of Parliament, than expose ourselves at intervals to such a mockery as this. If the Oath is powerless to exclude the avowed atheist, it is not easy to see what good it can possibly effect.

As yet the conscience of England seems to be wholly unmoved by the humiliating spectacle that has been recently presented to the world.

No Christian man could have read without deep pain the leader in the *Times* of January 13th, deprecating all further opposition to the admission of an atheist to the House of Commons, and one is tempted to ask whether *as a nation* we have lost all faith in the living God, and have come to regard words in reference to Him as mere empty signs rather than what they really are—expressive symbols of mighty realities. How is it that in Christian London no monster meetings have been held? How above all is it that at such a crisis our great religious societies are silent?

There are those that discover something more than a coincidence, a sort of connecting link between the act of profanation of January 13th, and the London Riots of February 8th. No doubt we must be very cautious in interpreting the dispensations of God's Providence, but no one can read his Bible and fail to see that national sins are the precursors of national judgments. The House of Commons is the representative of the nation, and thus far seems to have taken no step whatever to purge itself from all complicity with the guilt involved in the profanation of the Parliamentary Oath. Silent acquiescence in evil is surely as immoral, if not as injurious, as its perpetration.

B. BRIGSTOCKE, English Chaplain.
Homburg v. d. H., Germany.
February 16th, 1886.

## EUCHARISTIC WORSHIP.

SIR,—A correspondent speaks very well. He says, "We are not to worship His flesh and blood," again "the specific blessings which He calls His flesh and blood." Nothing can be better. This is "the virtual system," of which a contemporary says that the Primitive Church was not even tolerant of—easier said than proved. However one awaits the proof.

2. But I ask what your correspondent means by a "super-local presence"? Would he call the presence of the sun's light and heat super-local? This is tangible. Hazy language is useless.

3. He speaks of our Lord's Body being made "a spiritual body" after St. Paul. But what does he mean? What did St. Paul mean? Is it tantamount to what follows, "the last Adam was made a quickening spirit"? A spiritual body we have no idea of, no more than of a corporal spirit. He says, "We cannot say of a spiritual body whether it cannot be actually present in more places than one. The Black Rubric, as I have repeatedly shown, is simply out of court." This comes ill from one who has set his hand to its truth. But what says St. Augustine? "He," His Body, "spreadeth not Himself into all places. For it behoveth us to take great heed, lest, while we go about to maintain the glorious Deity of Him which was man, we leave Him not the true bodily substance of a man."

4. Some seem to ascribe this spiritual body merely to our ascended Lord. But it is of His risen Body that St. Paul speaks, the identity of which was, by touch, to be ascertained.

5. I wonder what Romanists make of "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." They say that the blood is grossly present in the Eucharist, because it is so in heaven, and that when the flesh is there the blood must be also. I do not know what a contemporary will say to this.

6. What has the doctrine of the Incarnation to do with the mode of Christ's presence, or His Body's presence, in the Eucharist? One has heard this so often spoken of that it is time to have its meaning plainly stated.

7. What have prayers for the dead to do with this? He acknowledges that a belief in the real presence—indefinite—does not make people "honest or truthful," but he says it makes them "devout." What does devout mean, if it does not include "honest and truthful"? What more than that we see here—a man washing his hands in holy water before he goes forth to commit a murder?

8. Your contemporary casts up holy eyes of horror, because Bishop Ryle does not wear a cope, and because Bishop Thorold condemns adoration of our Lord's Body locally present. But it scruples not to denounce the Black Rubric, which every clergyman declares to be sound doctrine. In its present number, February 19th, in a review of a book, it speaks of it thus: "That Black Rubric which was wisely discarded under Elizabeth, and foolishly reinserted at the last revision, with results which have been more harmful than the temporary abatement of Puritan objections was useful at the Restoration." This is inaccurate; the Rubric, rejected under Elizabeth, denied a Real Presence; that introduced by the Savoy divines denies only a Corporal Presence; the flippancy is admirable, with which it speaks of what Cosin, Sanderson, Thondike enacted—"foolishly reinstated" indeed! They did not act in a hurry. They told the Puritans, not that there is a corporate presence to be adored, but that the world is more in danger of profanation than of idolatry (Cardwell, p. 354). They could not say that now, when idolatry is advocated and the Black Rubric is condemned, because it forbids that idolatry. But though the Savoy Divines thought idolatry banished for ever, alas! for their charitable view—now belied—yet they introduced it for our protection, only changing "any real and essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" into "any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." How wise that reinsertion was, and providential, is now proved by the attempt to get rid of its obligation by the advocates of this idolatry which it condemned—that idolatry which the Bishops hoped was defunct, but which has now blossomed forth with all the insolence of Trent and the Mediæval Schoolmen.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

## Reviews and Notices.

"HYMNS." By the Very Rev. Daniel Bagot, D.D., Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. Pp. 131.

THIS volume of hymns, composed by Dean Bagot, we earnestly commend to our readers. The valuable Gospel truths which they set forth in simple, earnest language, we sincerely hope may prove useful to the general reader, and helpful to the Christian. Hymn 37, headed, "The Sinner's Petition," "Jesus, a sinner poor and weak;" and hymn 34, "The Christian's Comfort in Affliction," "It is I, be not afraid;" and hymn 56, "The Gospel Invitation," "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" and hymn 42, "Jesus, Master, have mercy on us," are a few among many others which we would specially commend to our readers. Most of the hymns are headed by a portion of Scripture. The volume is nicely bound, and printed in large type on excellent paper, and it is well adapted as a gift-book, and we trust it will have a large circulation.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allwork, Rev. Arthur, Curate at Southborough, Tunbridge Wells; Perpetual Curate of St. Philip's, Litherland.
Barber, Rev. S. F., Rector of East and West Raynham, Norfolk.
Birch, Rev. Francis Charles, B.A., Rector of Wilby and Hargham, Norfolk.
Blakeney, Rev. William Newcome, B.A., Vicar of Belton.
Blundell, Rev. Charles James Perne, M.A., Rector of Alderton-cum-Grafton Regis.
Cox-Edwards, Rev. John C., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the Portsmouth Dockyard.
Cramer, Right Rev. Francis Alexander Randall, Bishop of Nassau; Vicar of Milford.
Earle, Charles, B.A., Rector of Ingatestone with Buttsbury.
Edwards, Rev. A. W. H., Vicar of Kintbury.
Geldart, Rev. H., Rector of Bonchurch, Isle of Wight.
Hart, Rev. Robert, M.A., Vicar of Takeley, Essex; Rural Dean of the Newport Deanery.
Head, Rev. W., Minister of the newly constituted District of St. Basil, Deritend.
Hervey, Rev. Alfred Cyril, M.A., Rector of Hartley Mauditt.
Hubbard, Rev. C. E., Rector of St. Michael's, Lichfield.
Hughes, Rev. John, Vicar of Llanidloes.
Hull, Rev. Joseph Arthur, B.A., Vicar of Childerditch, Essex.
Johnson, Rev. Marcus Ernest William, Rector of Thelveton, Norfolk.
Margoliouth, Rev. G., Curate of Holy Trinity, Stepney; Organising Secretary to the Parochial Missions to the Jews' Fund.
Mayne, Rev. W. J., Vicar of Sherborne; Vicar of Charlton Kings.
Mullins, Rev. Edwin Herbert, Chaplain of the Infirmary and Workhouse of the Parish of St. Giles', Camberwell.
Phipps, Rev. P. W., Vicar of Upton-cum-Chelvey, Slough; Rector of Chalfont St. Giles.
Reynolds, Rev. Alfred Phillips, Curate-in-Charge of Thornton Hough; Vicar of Kingsley, Cheshire.
Rogers, Rev. S., Vicar of Long Compton, Warwickshire.
Sandford, Rev. George William, M.A., Rector of Stubton.
Smyth, Rev. J. B., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Impregnable*.
Winter, Rev. George William, M.A., Rector of Little Fransham, Norfolk.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Fitzgerald, Rev. Fredk., M.A., Rector of Beckingham, and formerly Canon of Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, at Beckingham Rectory, Newark, on the 20th inst.
Gardner, Rev. John, LL.D., Rector of Skelton, Yorkshire, at his residence, 5, the Circus, Bath, on the 18th inst., aged 62 years.
Gundry, Rev. John Seager, of Honiton, at 8, Devon Square, Newton Abbott, on the 15th inst.
Mayo, Rev. Charles Erskine, at Brooklyn Villa, Nottingham, on the 14th inst., aged 76.
Payne, Rev. William John, at Sible Hedingham, on the 16th inst., aged 61.
Pilling, Rev. John Rushworth, M.A., Rector of Wells-next-the-Sea, on the 19th inst., aged 59.
Wilson, Rev. Edward, B.A., for twenty-six years Vicar of St. Mary's, Hunslet, Leeds, at Newbould Lane, Sheffield, on the 20th inst., aged 71.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## NO. II.—SELF-SACRIFICE FOR LOVE'S SAKE.

By AUGUSTUS WM. GURNEY, Rector of Little Hereford, Tenbury.

A Sermon, in Continuation of No. I.—"The Potter and the Clay." Preached at Little Hereford.

"For I could wish that myself were accursëd from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh."—Romans ix. 3.

RECENTLY, when dealing with the subject of "The Potter and the Clay," a subject drawn from this same chapter, I endeavoured to speak some words in vindication of God's unswerving and eternal justice; and this I did as protesting against those imputations of inequality and favouritism in the Deity which are the inevitable outcome of the hateful teaching of Calvin. Then it was my duty to set before you some careful considerations upon a matter very liable to be misunderstood. Now I turn gladly to that which needs no defence, even to the noble wish, amounting to a prayer, expressed by St. Paul in the text, which you shall hear again in its full meaning: "For I could wish that myself were accursëd [or anathema] from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh." What a sweet and tender self-effacement is here shown! And I ask, brethren, if this wish or prayer be so noble, as it confessedly is, how is it conceivable that a portion of the same short chapter in which it occurs could sin gravely and cruelly against equity,—as it has been adjudged to do by rash and misdeeming men? How came men not to feel that the Calvinistic interpretation of the Potter and the Clay was an offence against God's truth, more especially when viewed in relation to the cry of the text? Is the creature more generous than the Creator? And again, Can the Apostle attain the extreme of nobility and of baseness almost in a breath? "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?" No, dear brethren; all here in truth is sweet together, the Apostle's mention of the Potter and the Clay having an especial sweetness of its own, as I strove to explain, in spite of any appearance to the contrary, because it is intended to reconcile us to the inequalities of human conditions, and so to close the lips of gainsayers by convincing them that eventually the Judge of all the earth will do right. It is to silence our distrustful envyings and ungracious murmurings that God speaks by St. Paul, instructing us that here on earth He calls some, and does not call others, but that these distinctions are for a time only, since in the end perfect justice (and that is the justice of love) will be administered to all. The few and many stripes will make all clear.

And now I say again, that portion of this chapter upon which I lately dwelt needed careful investigation, unless sadness, if not despair, were to be our dole. But here in the text there is nothing even on the surface but that which rejoices the heart and satisfies the mind.

How very dearly did St. Paul love his own people, the Jews! his love for them being, I may observe, a type of God's love for all His creatures. St. Paul's noble aspiration cannot but remind us of the prayer of Moses, when, speaking to the Lord concerning the transgression of the Israelites, he said (Ex. xxxii. 31, 32): "Oh, this people have sinnëd a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if Thou wilt, forgive their sin; and if not, blot *me*, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written." The one prayer is as nobly unselfish as the other; the prayer of St. Paul equals in generosity that of Moses; it could not go beyond it. Both prayers assume alike that God may be pleased, in some sense, to accept of the self-sacrifice of an innocent person for the sins of the guilty. They recall strikingly the memory of our beloved Lord and Master, who laid down His life for sinners, who died that we might live for evermore.

It is therefore the self-sacrifice of the Lord of all which stands behind the spirit of self-sacrifice in Moses and in St. Paul, and it is this which heightens its amazing glory. "Like Master, like servant." Moses, it is clear, declared by Pharaoh even to be "a man in whom the Spirit of God is," had a large share in that spirit of self-sacrifice which has its home in heaven in the recesses of Triune Deity; yet can he scarcely have apprehended, save in some vague and uncertain sense, that God's only-begotten Son should die upon the Cross for the world's salvation. But the self-same order of love which fills all heaven filled his heart also. Hence arose his heavenly aspiration. St. Paul, on the other hand, surveyed the height and the depth of the self-sacrifice of Christ the Lord; and being inspired by that which he beheld, he indulged in the large-hearted hope that he too might be allowed to do something and to suffer something for sinners in distant imitation of His Lord and Master. And, beloved brethren, before we pass on, let us warm our cold hearts, if it be but for a moment, in the assured knowledge which we possess of the great self-sacrifice of all the ages; let us think of this amazing truth—God, the Triune God, willing from everlasting to suffer and to die for man in the person of the first-begotten of the Father, to reconcile the world to God.

And now, as is fitting at this time—to speak chiefly of St. Paul's wish or prayer in the text—how thoroughly does it lay open to us the affectionate nature of the great Apostle! St. Paul had found Christ the Saviour of his soul, but so long as his brethren had not found Him, he could not be altogether happy. St. Paul, we have every reason to conclude, cherished a strong hope, nay, a deep conviction, of the ultimate salvation of all men; and so, writing in the maturity of his inspired insight into things divine to Timothy, he thus expressed himself concerning God our Saviour (1 Tim. ii. 4): "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth;" and further, writing to the same Timothy, he could say (1 Tim. iv. 10): "We trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe." But, for all that, my brethren, it made St. Paul unhappy, and at times almost miserable, to be sitting down himself to a rich banquet (the Christian marriage-feast), whilst those he best loved were nigh to starving without. Who, let me ask, could enjoy a feast from which he saw his brothers shut out? He had, he said, great sorrow and continual affliction on their account.

And yet we can see that, through all, St. Paul deeply trusted God's goodness. He was far indeed from holding that his countrymen, the Jews, had forfeited heaven for ever and ever; but he perceived that already they were undergoing grave punishment. O that he might be permitted to bear it for them! he thought. So he approaches God in prayer. And he comes to Him as to a God who, having accepted the great self-sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, may probably sanction in His servants lesser self-sacrifices for the sins of men, and certainly does so, though not quite in the sense the Apostle contemplates.* Very sweet and noble is the aspiration of an innocent man to be allowed to suffer for the guilty; and, if noble in our eyes as Christians, then surely noble also in the sight of God. But there must be a limit, of course, to the self-sacrifices of sinners for sinners. Were it not forbidden, we might easily conceive of the innocent mother electing to burn for her guilty children, so defeating—were that possible—the justice of the Almighty. St. Paul does not stand alone in the depth of his affectionate nature. The spirit of self-sacrifice exists in every loving and generous breast, and cannot fail of being very dear to God. But, once for all, "No man may deliver his brother, nor make agreement unto God for him; for it cost more to redeem their souls, so that he must leave that alone for ever" (Psalm xlix. 7, 8). In the sense of suffering meritoriously for others there is one Mediator only—the Man Christ Jesus. And yet, mark this, brethren, every act of righteous self-sacrifice is accepted in Him, and, though it has no merit of its own, acquires a borrowed merit from its Lord, just as the moon's light is borrowed from the sun. So, then, the Apostle, making herein a venture of faith, prayed that a portion of God's most just anger against his guilty brethren might fall upon himself, though he were innocent. He could bear God's anger, so he thinks, at least. If need be, he could bear to be under God's disfavour for a time; in particular, it might be, to be shut out for a season from Christian ordinances; to be debarred even from the breaking of bread; what know I? to be deprived of his very Apostleship, if only his beloved countrymen could be restored the sooner to God's favour.*

Such was the Apostle's aspiration. And though not answered in the letter, it was to be in the spirit. But these are the deep things of God, into which it does not behove us to look too far. It may be that every pain and suffering (borne lovingly for our Master's and for the brethren's sake) is, in some mysterious way, helpful in the communion of saints to all our fellow-creatures. We should not indeed ask to be separated from God, or even to suffer at all: such a petition seems too bold; yet God may so order it, and probably does, that the long-continued and willingly endured sufferings of some poor bedridden Christian may be productive of a mysterious gain to the whole Church of God—a wonderful and most consoling thought.

No doubt the Apostle's trial might have been far severer. I mean, if St. Paul could have believed, which he did not, that his countrymen, for rejecting Christ, would be lost for ever and ever, *that* might have driven him to actual despair. For if St. Paul could not easily endure so much as the temporary estrangement of his brethren from God, and was willing and anxious to make any lawful and permissible sacrifice of self on their behalf,—how do we suppose he could have borne the everlasting banishment of those he loved from heaven? We may well ask, Could that heaven contain St. Paul which should not also, at some time or other, contain his brethren and his kinsmen? Nay, is there one of us who could contemplate with any satisfaction endless happiness for himself, whilst even one soul that he loves lies in neverending misery? God has given us feeling

* See the "Life of M. Vianney," the saintly Curé d'Ars, who shared in this noble aspiration. It was his generous impulse to seek to lend greater weight to the slight penances which he bound upon his feebler penitents by taking upon himself those more serious penances which they had deserved: "Ecoutez, répondit-il, voici une bonne recette: leur donner une petite pénitence *et faire* le reste à leur place."—Vol. i., page 301.

"Il a dit d'autres fois: j'accepterais bien de souffrir cent ans les douleurs les plus aiguës, pourvu que le bon Dieu daignât m'accorder la conversion de ma paroisse."—Vol. ii., page 481. Paris: Charles Douniol, Rue de Tournon, 29.

* In fine he desired to fill up that which was behind of the afflictions of Christ his Master in his own flesh or person for His Body's sake, which is the Church (Col. i. 24).

hearts, dear brethren, and we thank Him therefore; and we then please Him best when we give those hearts free play. How then should the joys of heaven be true joys, so long as the hopeless wail of one lost soul pierced its portals? And truly, there is no need to see or hear a soul in pain for our pity to be aroused. The mere knowledge that such was the case would suffice. The miner at the pit's mouth hears no sound and sees no sight of physical suffering; but if he is made aware that his pit companions are below and in danger, he risks life eagerly on the chance of saving them. But hell is a pit (say some Christians) from which there is no possible rescue or redemption. Once in that pit there is no coming out. That is the evil tradition which our immediate forefathers have handed down to us. And I ask, does it not sound hateful when thus plainly set forth? The mere false reflection of the fires of imaginably endless hell has a tendency to harden men's hearts? But our comfort is that this is only what men, oppressed by a gloomy and morose tradition, have read or written into God's Word. Our authorised translation errs confessedly from this cause, whilst not even the Revised Version is so free from fatal error in this respect as it ought to be.*

And to pass on. Surely not any will question that the same spirit of self-sacrifice which is acceptable to God whilst men abide on earth will continue to be acceptable to Him when they are in heaven. And as men become more and more purified by dwelling nearer and nearer to God, we doubt not that the spirit of self-sacrifice shall wax ever deeper and deeper within them. Surely in heaven itself Moses and St. Paul, ay, and those brave miners of whom I spoke just now, will be found among them that are like-minded with their Lord and Master, like-minded in respect of the spirit of self-sacrifice for love's own sake. There, in heaven, is the centre of all-conquering love. We on earth may possibly wax cold and listless in the recovery of such as are lost and out of the way; but the blessed ones, who resemble their Lord and Master, never—never.

And can any who acknowledge the glory and beauty of self-sacrifice for others' sake still cling to the frightful tradition that for some lost souls there is no hope? Alas! they do, they will. Let us by an effort place ourselves for a moment at their distressing point of view. Then, what is this vision which flashes on our sight? And yet it is no vision for believers in a God of love. The vision is for such as believe in a God of vengeance. Methinks, brethren, these loving but deluded ones might well dream that they saw a wondrous sight in heaven: the host of the redeemed, themselves among them, kneeling in prayer, and that prayer—the prayer of Moses, the prayer of St. Paul, only more urgent, ever rising, and taking no denial, that they, even they themselves, "might be accursëd from Christ," at least for a season, for their brethren's sake, who were in the place of never-ending sin and torment. But, truly, no such prayer shall need to be made. Scatter the vision, beloved, as dishonouring in the highest degree to the Almighty! Those blessed ones are satisfied already—who can doubt it?—by the fatherly assurance that God shall be All in all (1 Cor. xv. 28). God speed the time of His infinite mercy! And do Thou forgive me, Heavenly Father, for so much as questioning, though in seeming only, for a single instant Thy all embracing love!

And now, what more should I say? See to it, brethren, that you go forward in the spirit of self-sacrifice. Though neither Moses nor St. Paul, dear and illustrious saints, were suffered to sacrifice themselves in the sense in which they made their prayer, yet did God accept and exact from their hands the sacrifice of nearly everything besides—St. Paul, in particular, undergoing stripes and imprisonments, and hardships past counting, and unequalled labours, and a martyr's death for the brethren's sake—aye, and for the sake of such as had not yet become brethren. See, then, your opportunities, beloved, and avail yourself of them! By your prayers, and by many a self-sacrificing word and deed, labour for your fellow-beings. Do not, indeed, expect to be able to make atonement for their sins; but, short of that, what is there you may not do and suffer? A self-sacrificing spirit is the reflection of the perfect love of God. O that each of us might learn to make sacrifices for others. Would, in particular, that they who are "made unto honour" would make sacrifices for those who are "made unto dishonour." So shall the kingdom of God come more and more perfectly on earth below, till there be a new heaven and a new earth, till the light of the Sun of Righteousness be sevenfold, and the Moon, the Church, be as the Sun reflecting her Lord and Master's glory, till the veil of doubt and disbelief be taken away that is over the face of all nations, and the knowledge of the glory of the Lord cover the earth as the waters cover the seas.

* Wonderful to say, the word *αἰωνιος* is rendered in the Revised Version "eternal," instead of "age-long" or 'æonial," and even the word "hell" is not wholly banished rom the text.

---

AT the annual meeting of the Clergy Orphan Corporation the chair was taken by Viscount Cranbrook. The report showed a debt to the treasurer of £1,443, and the committee appealed earnestly to the clergy and laity, and especially the former, to increase the annual income of the corporation. Otherwise recourse must be had to the capital fund, on the maintenance of which the stability of the schools depended. The Archbishop of Canterbury was re-elected president, Lord Cranbrook vice-president, the Master of the Charterhouse treasurer, and the Rev. T. W. Gibson secretary for the ensuing year.

## THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

By the Rev. E. MARTYN VENN, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Athboy, Co. Meath.

Sermon Preached at Trim, on Sunday, April 19th, 1885.

"These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so."—Acts xvii. 11.

In the early days of the Christian Church Judaism was one of the most dangerous foes with which the advocates of our faith were obliged to contend, all the more so because many of the earliest converts to Christianity—perhaps the greater part of them — were by birth Jews, and accordingly inclined, not unnaturally, to attach very great importance to the law of Moses, the rite of circumcision, and other observances, to which they had been accustomed from their early years. So, if we follow the course of St. Paul's missionary travels, we see that, in almost all cases, it was the Jews who stirred up the people of various towns against him, and caused him to be beaten, stoned and imprisoned. It was on account of Judaising emissaries at Antioch, who taught the necessity of observing the Mosaic ceremonial, that the first great council was summoned at Jerusalem in the year 50 A.D., and a resolution passed adverse to their claims. Some of the first persecutions to which the Christians were subjected in the city of Rome were owing to the influence of Jews at the imperial court of the Cæsars; and during the first two or three centuries of her history the Church in the East suffered considerably from the secession of those, notably the Ebionites and the Marcionites, who thought that her discipline was too lax, and that the law of Moses was to be observed in its utmost strictness.

So when St. Paul, in his second missionary journey, came to Thessalonica, which, under its modern name of Saloniki, still retains its ancient greatness, and repairing to the Jewish Synagogue on three following Sabbaths, argued that the Messiah was no temporal prince, but that Jesus, whom they had crucified, his words were variously received. Some, including a number of Greek proselytes and influential women, believed. But the Jews, furious at such obnoxious tenets, threw the town into an uproar, and dragged Paul before the assembly of the people, on the charge of proclaiming another king, one Jesus. Their malice was ineffective, for the magistrates released the prisoners, but the apostolic band, finding that they could do no more work there to any good purpose, went away by night to Beræa, a place sixty miles south of Thessalonica, where Paul found another synagogue—so widely were the Jews spread in those days, throughout every city of importance, from east to west, and from north to south—and these Beræan Jews, as my text says, were more candid, generous and willing hearers than those whom he had just left, and searched the Scriptures daily to see whether his arguments were well founded.

Now we must all admit that in so doing those hearers of the Apostle showed a very wise discretion, and took the only right and proper course, for when a man preaches a new doctrine to an audience of sensible persons, they will not rashly raise a cry against him or stigmatise him as a false teacher, however novel his theories may be, but will carefully examine the arguments the groundwork upon which he bases his appeal, and if they be found to be correct, they will accept his conclusion. Now it is, of course, a truism in these days to tell an educated congregation that the Bible is the foundation of our religion, and yet it may not be altogether unnecessary to do so, for those who watch the state of religious thought in these times are not unaware that it is in a very unsettled condition. Many old beliefs are giving way, while others, newer and more fashionable, are taking their place. In this process, no doubt, some errors of long standing, the offspring of priestcraft and ignorance, have been amended or removed, but there can be little doubt that much of truth has been obscured and put aside, and the facilities for obtaining notoriety, which our modern civilisation gives, have produced many different leaders, each attended by his particular clique of followers. One man says that his theological system is the true key of eternal life. Another speedily arises to condemn the first and his teaching as unorthodox or uncatholic; the vaguer the terms of censure the better; one believes in the efficacy of albs and chasubles, pictures and processions to aid the faith of the weaker brethren; another sternly disdains any but the very simplest forms of prayer, and the barest kind of building in which to offer it up to God. In London you may go in the morning to a Theistic "Church," and hear a service devoted to God the Father alone, the existence of the second and third persons in the Holy Trinity being ignored altogether; in the afternoon you may go to a fine "Cathedral," and see a man who claims to be—in sober earnest—the only remaining inspired successor of the Apostles; and in the evening you may gaze at—you need hardly hope to understand—the latest development of Anglican ritual; while at most hours you can behold that shocking parody of religion which is perpetrated by the Salvation Army. In fine, there are in Great Britain nearly 250 different sects of Protestants, of one sort or another, and besides all of these there are the Freethinkers, whose motto since the time of Pope has been:

> For creeds and forms let senseless bigots fight,
> He can't be in the wrong, whose life is in the right.

Amid all this chaos of conflicting opinion, it may

not be altogether inappropriate to call attention to the fact that the Bible, the inspired Word of God, is the foundation of our religion, and the ultimate arbiter of all disputed questions of doctrine in preference to the private opinions of this man or that man, or the prejudices of different sects. If we turn to the articles of our Church, we shall find it stated that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary for salvation, so that whatsoever is not written therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." It is, therefore, the boast of our Church, and, indeed, of most Protestant bodies, that the tenets which they profess are founded upon strictly Biblical authority. In the great majority of cases it is not points of vital doctrine, but of internal constitution and discipline which have caused other bodies of Christians to separate themselves from us. We and they hold the same creeds, which are the backbone of our faith, but it is the question of Scriptural authority for various forms and ceremonies which is mainly responsible for the appearance of this fatal disunion in our midst, and in this connection we are brought face to face with the question of "private judgment." Now we know that our Roman Catholic neighbours will, on no account whatever, allow this to the members of their communion, whether they be clergy or laity. A certain path is prescribed for them, certain doctrines are laid down, and no kind of discussion or difference of opinion is ever allowed on points of Scripture which are difficult to be understood. The Church of Rome has declared in what way they are to be interpreted, and she will not allow that interpretation to be questioned in the slightest degree. You probably know that during the dark or middle ages, which extended, roughly speaking, from 500—1500 A.D., the study of the Bible was strictly confined to the clergy, or to such of them as chose to take the trouble to study it, and at many periods that number was not at all large—while the laity, such few of them, that is to say, as were able to read the Word of God, were strictly prohibited from doing so. But after the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, when Eastern learning, driven from its own home, began to spread itself over the west, and great Greek scholars began to attract numerous audiences to their lecture rooms in Italy and France, a new period of learning and of thought commenced to dawn upon Europe. Men began to reason for themselves, and to ask if all the accustomed fetters which religion and politics alike had placed upon their minds were right or justifiable, and the Renaissance became an accomplished fact—that period in which the dormant energies of Western Europe awoke from their long lethargy, and compassed the downfall of tyrants and hierarchs alike. One of the chief results of this new thought was the Reformation, directed probably as much against the extravagant temporal claims of the Roman pontiffs as against their spiritual errors and corruption. However that may be, even Rome could no longer exercise such an absolute control as before over the consciences of her followers, at least, in the more northern parts of Europe, whose people could not entirely subordinate their vigorous spirit of independence to a monk or a confessor. And so circumstances have compelled the Papal see, since the Reformation, to modify in some degree her rigorous absolutism in religious matters. Roman Catholics are now allowed to read the Bible—although the practice is discouraged—but they are absolutely compelled, even in the most trifling matters of doubt, to accept the interpretation of their Church, which is printed in the margin, or at the bottom of their bibles, and not the slightest latitude of thought is allowed to them under severe penalties. Some Roman prelates attempt to disguise this fact, under the idea, presumably, that in the present days of almost universal liberty, or license, the knowledge of such repression may injure their cause; others, like the late Cardinal Wiseman, more honest or more rash, from whichever point of view you regard the matter, have openly avowed and boasted of it, and have instanced the endless divisions and quarrels of Protestants as the baneful result of an unrestrained and free use of the Bible by all alike. Now, we members of the Reformed Churches—and here we are happily all of one opinion—do assert, most unhesitatingly, that in our opinion there can be no evil so great as the denial of the Bible to the members of our several communions, or that very strict supervision of the conscience, which will on no account allow a man to exercise his private judgment on any matter connected with religion, however comparatively unimportant. We are sure that the superstition and priestcraft and unholy practices, which resulted from the religious policy of the middle ages, are worse even than the disunion which has followed upon its collapse. Moreover, the character of our race, both national and individual, would no longer tolerate it, except possibly in the case of a very few individuals. But the student of history knows well that when men's minds have shaken off any old belief, which had long held them enthralled, whether religious, political, scientific, or otherwise, there is always a tendency to rush into the opposite extreme, and so it has been often since the great Reformation. As soon as men were allowed to read the Bible freely, thousands of people, without any qualification of intellect or real piety, at once imagined that it was their right and even their duty to become Scriptural critics, and loudly assert their own peculiar views. So arose among others the Anabaptists, a sect of communists who, besides their peculiar views on baptism, imagined, or at any rate declared that God had given the pro-

ducts of the earth in common to all, and endeavoured to put their tenets into practical execution. I need hardly point out to you that if they had studied the Bible at all carefully, they would have seen no ground for their opinions.

Now, with regard to "private judgment," it is a very excellent thing, and one which we shall ever refuse to surrender, but there must be two conditions to the exercise of it. 1. Those who are absolutely unqualified from ignorance to judge of difficult passages of Scripture, should not presume to do so. 2. This right should not be allowed to create disunion within the Church, and by so doing impair her efficacy of resistance to the foes of God and His religion. Now, about the first condition, it may safely be asserted that there are a good many passages in the Bible which are by no means easy to understand; this is especially true of the epistles of St. Paul, which are often very glibly quoted, but seldom properly understood. Those who have studied his writings critically know how very difficult it is to follow his train of thought, which often outruns the words of which he makes use. There is one verse in an epistle of his, of which no less than 250 interpretations have been given, and there are others which, though less disputed than that, have yet given rise to much variety of exposition. Those who think that the Bible presents no difficulty of comprehension should look at the Speaker's Commentary, and the large edition of Alford's Commentary on the New Testament—when, I think, if they are open to conviction, they will alter their hasty and rash opinion. The fact is that very many of those who talk so confidently about Scriptural authority for certain practices, or the want of it, are people who very rarely read the Word of God attentively themselves, but have picked up a set of opinions, at second-hand from some one else, which they will not take the trouble to verify, but which they are most positive in asserting. If all Scripture were really so simple that a child or an illiterate person could understand it, it is difficult to see why clergymen should go into a pulpit and preach sermons Sunday after Sunday, or why they should have to undergo any examination in the Scriptures and other subjects of Divinity before they receive Ordination. They need, in that case, have no further qualifications for their office than a strong voice and a certain power of exciting hysterical emotions in their hearers, like the cobblers and farm labourers, who, in many parts of England, expound the Scripture on Sunday as far as they are able, in the country villages, or the Salvationists, who perform the same part in the large towns. There are many of us, who have no mean knowledge of the art and practice of medicine, yet in case of bodily need, such people neither have recourse to a quack practitioner, nor imagine that they are competent to treat the case themselves. And though we are often slow to confess it, our spiritual needs are far more important than those of the body. Most of the dwellers in towns know, in a general way, that the bread which they eat is procured by sowing corn, reaping, grinding and baking it, but if, with no further knowledge than that, they were to set up as farmers or millers, it would not be at all hard to foresee the speedy result of their foolish self-confidence. And the case is the same in matters of religion. Our Church gladly concedes the right of private judgment, but she properly expects that those who use it will previously qualify themselves in the fitting manner.

The second condition that I mentioned was that this liberty of thought should not be allowed to introduce disunion into the Church. We followers of Christ have, from very ancient times, been compared to an army, whose adversaries are no earthly ones, but the world and the powers of evil. But an army is useless without discipline and cohesion; each division must not act selfishly and regard merely its own advantage, but must keep touch with, and give support to its neighbour, and all alike must yield an implicit obedience to the orders of the superior officer. The various Protestant Churches, I fear, have lost their cohesion, and are fighting each for their own hand; and worse than that, many of them are even fighting against each other, and with a very bitter hostility. Now if this was the case with an earthly army it would not require much wisdom to foretell that the common enemy would attack and rout each of these hostile units in detail, and I fear that with us, too, a common disaster may be the result, if we do not all rally to the standard of our common religion. Our most deadly foe in these days is infidelity, and the Archbishop of York, in an address to his clergy the other day, spoke in the strongest terms of the pressing need that they should qualify themselves to contend against this foe. In Ireland we have not as yet, happily, much practical experience of the danger, but in England Bradlaugh and his followers are very active in the cause of evil — America has his counterpart in Ingersoll, and others like him, while in France, not long ago, a public speaker told his audience that there was no God. It is useless to blink these facts, or to ignore them and leave the field to our enemies — to be forewarned is to be forearmed. And yet, alas! in the face of this fearful menace and danger rival Protestant sects, instead of combining against the common foe, continue to fight and bicker with each other, and sometimes even carry their rancour so far as to deny eternal salvation to those who do not belong to their own body, though in all essential respects their creeds are the same. Such presumption would really be almost ludicrous, were it not so awfully wicked, and incredible, were not many people able to

state its truth from their own experience. Thank God, I think that I may say that in our own Church such awful bigotry, such uncharitable and arrogant presumption is almost unknown. But it certainly does exist among some other parties. And what a handle it gives to the atheist! Can you not imagine his scorn, as he sees so-called Christians arrogating to themselves the right, which belongs to God alone, and condemning their fellows to eternal perdition, because they differ from themselves in some matters of form or ceremony, or of the constitution of the Church; for, as I said before, in essential matters of creed and doctrine we are almost all at one. The Wesleyans, to take a single instance, were in communion with the Church till the death of their founder, and if they had observed his last request they would be so now. I believe I am right in saying that here in Ireland the Primitive Methodists are still in communion with us, or were so till a very few years ago. How long is this terrible disunion to continue? Why is there variance between us and our fellow-Christians, whom, if we followed out our Master's instructions, we should love instead of avoiding? Of course, I know that a variety of human motives, more or less unworthy, operate on both sides to keep us apart, but what is really the value of our religious professions, if they are always to be subordinated to mutual jealousies and dissensions? Must he be, indeed, nothing but a foolish Utopian dreamer, who can imagine a reunion of the various Christian bodies, whose creed is the same? I hope not. I hope that the day may come, perhaps even in the lifetime of some of us who are here, when this dream may become a noble fact—a veritable triumph for Christendom, more potent than the swords of thousands of Crusaders, or the honeyed words which might fall from the lips of a thousand Chrysostoms. In former times, when agnostic tenets were only whispered with bated breath in the secret conclaves of a few quasi-learned men, this disunion among Christians, shameful though it was, was of infinitely less consequence than now, when scepticism stalks openly through the land, and disbelief is avowed with unblushing effrontery. How long are different sects of Protestants to fight and bicker with each other in this contemptible and unchristian manner, careless all the while of the general weal of Christ's Church on earth, and unobservant of the progress of the enemy who threatens all alike?

This state of things is partly the result of an abuse of the right of private judgment. Puritans, Presbyterians, Baptists, and others, imagining apparently that their own judgment was infallible, preferred, rather than relinquish their particular opinions, to inflict a certain injury upon the general cause of religion by their desertion. But, as I said before, an army cannot exist without discipline. Unless defeat is to be courted, there must be some head, to whom obedience is paid. There is an old saying, that there are as many different opinions as there are men to entertain them; but what society of any kind, religious or otherwise, could continue to exist, if individual members were constantly to carry their own right of judgment so far as to leave it upon every difference of opinion? Individuals must sometimes give way, because if every one insisted on being leader there would soon be no one to be led. If no one will ever admit that he is wrong, who could ever be in the right? Let us all, to whatever denomination we belong, endeavour, as far as is possible, to smooth away our several differences, instead of maintaining them with bitterness and uncharitable rancour.

Finally, I would remind you that we appeal to nothing but the inspired Word of God. We are not like the Pharisees, who made the Scriptures of none effect by their traditions, or the Roman Catholics, who imitate them in later times. Search the Scriptures daily, like the Beræans, but exercise your right of private judgment with wisdom and discretion, and be sure in the first place that you are properly qualified to use it, and beware above all things how you become the authors of dissension and discontent; for such things are easily kindled, but allayed with great difficulty. Be diligent in reading the Bible at your own homes, come regularly to the house of God to hear it expounded, and when you are there, be not careless or inattentive, as if it were a matter of no particular importance. Train up your children also in the study of God's Word, that religion, pure and undefiled, may be handed down from father to son, and God's blessing may rest upon you and them alike.

---

THE statute on the Oxford divinity examinations has now been printed in the *Gazette*, and the preamble will be discussed by Congregation on March 9. The subject has been much debated during the last year, and the Hebdomadal Council have had various schemes before them; but although very few are satisfied with the present state of the examinations, the difficulties in the way of a change are so great that a settlement of the question will be no easy matter. One scheme which had been prepared by the council was so little likely to be accepted that it was never laid before Congregation, and the present statute has been substituted. It is now proposed to solve the difficulties attending the examination in the Rudiments of Faith and Religion by abolishing it altogether, and to establish a voluntary examination which may be taken up by passmen as one of the parts of their final schools. The examination in the four Gospels in Moderations is retained. It is uncertain as yet how this proposal will be received. The principal difficulty which Churchmen will find in its acceptance consists in the fact that no provision is made for even a voluntary divinity examination in the case of honourmen, who now form so large a proportion of the University. Apart from this, the scheme, with some modifications, might work well.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 6, 1886.

## CLERICAL INCOMES.

ONE of the subjects mentioned in the recent Memorial on Church Reform, was "to bring about a more equal division of the revenues of the Church," and consequently a greater equalisation of clerical incomes. This is a subject which needs looking into, but it is one which bristles with difficulties on all sides, and it is also one upon which no hard and fast law can be made. We are well aware that there are inequalities in the value of livings, just as there are inequalities in every other profession; and therefore, while there may be a laudable desire for greater equalisation, yet we feel that something more is wanted than a mere general statement, and it is when we descend to particulars that we find how very difficult it is to deal with the subject.

The first thing, of course, is the income of the Bishops. Many outsiders think that for an Archbishop to receive ten or fifteen thousand a year is a very great deal, or for a Bishop to receive six thousand, and another Bishop four thousand, and so it is, on the face of it; but when we look behind the scenes, and see what are the calls made upon the episcopal purse, and the immense size of the palaces that have to be kept up, we see at once that the income is not too large. Take, for instance, the Archbishop of York; he has £10,000 a year, it is true, but he has an immense house at Bishopthorpe, a place some three miles away from his cathedral city, with large grounds, which of necessity require a large retinue of servants. So, again, the Bishop of Durham has the large castle at Auckland, but in addition to his other work, he has several young men reading for Holy Orders living with him. The writer once stayed at Auckland Castle for a night, and in the Episcopal Chapel counted no less than twenty-two domestic servants, to say nothing of coachmen, gardeners, and others. Add to which that the Bishop is extremely liberal, and so while we require the members of the Episcopal Bench to live in palatial buildings, and to maintain their positions as peers of the realm, we must allow them incomes of sufficient value to keep up that position. It has been urged that the Bishops in these days should live in their cathedral cities, and in good-sized, suitable houses; and of course if this were done, much less would suffice, but if we once begin to alter these things, the question is where shall we end, and what will be the result?

There is one thing which seems to call for some alteration, and that is the abolition of pluralities—not in livings, for these have been abolished for some years, but in offices. For instance, we find in a certain county a worthy gentleman who holds a canonry ostensibly worth some £700 a year, together with a living worth some £800 a year, and an archdeaconry in addition. So, also, until within a short time ago, the Brothers of St. Katharine's Hospital, in the Regent's Park, were allowed to hold livings some miles away from town, and were only required to be present at the Hospital for four months in the year, for which they received the sum of £300 a year, together with a capital house. We are constantly hearing the cry that the Church is unable to meet the demands laid upon her, and we feel that these pluralities should be abolished. A canon of a cathedral church should have some special work given him in the diocese, either as missioner, or some other special work, which, together with attendance at the cathedral, would be ample employment for him, and a canonry as the reward for some work done for the Church, should not be added on to the other parochial work, which makes a greater demand upon a man's time than he can really attend to.

With regard to parochial clergymen, the case is somewhat different; yet, in any case where there is a large endowment for the mother-church and a small population, and within the bounds of the ancient parish a daughter-church with a large and growing population, there should be some equalisation of the income; but not to be entirely manipulated by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who will take the surplus from the mother-church and possibly after all will not endow the daughter-church, because, perhaps, everything is not in exact accordance with their stipulated rules. But with regard to many so-called *livings*, things are in anything but a prosperous condition. In consequence of the agricultural depression, livings which used to be worth some four and five hundred pounds a year are now scarcely worth anything at all. Whether there is any silver lining to the dark clouds which now overshadow the Church it is hard to say, certain it is, that there is little to be looked for while the present Government is in office, except the use of axes and hatchets to chop down the Constitution of the State, and of *the Church if need be*, provided it can thereby keep in office.

The present is indeed a trying time; tithe decreasing, glebe lands unlet, and no class of men feel these things more than the clergy; therefore, while it is desirable that there should be some equalisation of clerical incomes, it can-

not be by reducing the incomes of the rura clergy. But we feel that the time has come for a looking into the causes of the depression and easing the burden of the clergy, who are already overweighted.

It is all very well for certain of the clergy, well circu mstanced in city livings, to bring forward these subjects, and to propose sweeping measures of Church Reform ; but there is an old proverb which says "Look before you leap," and therefore, while some abuses exist, let us look into matters and carefully count the cost, else the result will be confusion worse confounded.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### THE IRISH AND BRITISH QUESTION.

SIR,—I shall close the correspondence, so far as I am concerned, with this letter, in which I shall set before your readers certain extracts in support of the views advocated in my former communications.

I have endeavoured to explain :—

1. That if Home Rule be conceded it must take the form of a concession meeting the demands of the Irish irreconcileables, otherwise it can do no good, and must lead to fresh agitation, renewed strife, and endless bickerings between the two countries.

2. That a concession satisfactory to the Irish Nationalists must result in open war between the loyal and the disloyal, or in the sure and certain extirpation, by slow but effectual means, of all that now constitutes the wealth and respectability, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, of this country.

I proceed now to quote authorities.

Would there be danger to the property and lives of the minority if Home Rule were granted? Here is the opinion of Professor Maguire, a Roman Catholic and an Irishman :—

Were Ireland materially joined to England, no one would dream of Home Rule in the sense that three millions of the population, whose views are at variance with those of the thirty odd millions, would be left free *to butcher* an odd million which agreed with the thirty odd millions.—*England's Duty to Ireland, as plain to a Loyal Irish Roman Catholic.* By Thomas Maguire, LL.D., Dublin, Professor of Moral Philosophy, Fellow and Tutor Trinity College, Dublin. McGee, 18, Nassau Street, Dublin. Price 6*d*.

Home Rule means *the boycotting and massacre* of the loyalists. —*Ibid.* p. 8.

We are told the majority will tolerate and protect the minority. Will they? Everything tells the other way.—*Ibid.* p. 11.

Again, the Archbishop (Walsh) tells us he must have Trinity College—the only thing in Ireland that an Irishman need not be ashamed of.—*Ibid.* p. 12.

Now two powerful parties support Home Rule as a means to an end—the farmers and the Priests. The farmers want to get rid of all their obligations to the landlord and everybody else. The priests, or at least the bishops, want to get education into their hands, I believe, for the purpose of *crushing it altogether.* —*Ibid.* p. 16.

Mr. Laing tells us, in *The Nineteenth Century*, that religious animosity has died away in Ireland. *It never was so strong.*—*Ibid.* p. 19.

This is the opinion of one qualified to speak on the Irish Question, and he deliberately tells us that Home Rule means civil war—the ruin of the loyalists—the overthrow of education. Either then English statesmen must pay this price for the shadowy phantom of the support of a faction bitterly disloyal, or they must vindicate the law and protect property and individual liberty. Which will they do?

Here is an extract from "The Priest in Politics," by the late P. J. Smyth, also a Roman Catholic and a Nationalist M.P.

"If Christ Himself were to come on this platform and attempt to oppose the League, He would be hooted." So vociferated an enthusiastic orator at one of the meetings. Where were the priests? They were there, some of them. They heard, and were silent. More than that, by their active aid the blasphemer was raised to the position of a paid Member of Parliament. At all the meetings the priesthood were, and continue to be, largely represented.—*The Priest in Politics*, p. 7.

Mr. Timothy Michael Healy on one occasion described a Papal Allocution sent over to this country, which condemned the Parnell Fund as "an idiotic circular." Yet within a few weeks after this astounding assertion he was chosen by the assembled priesthood as the Nationalist candidate for Monaghan. Of course we know that the priests are as loyal to the Pope as ever they were, but why have they consented to wink at crimes that disgrace human nature, and at open insult to one whom they believe to be the Vicar of God. *Cui bono?*

I quote the following extract from Pigott's "Recollections of an Irish Journalist." Mr. Pigott is a Nationalist and a Roman Catholic :—

"You must," said a minister of God's mercy, a Catholic priest, at a Land League meeting in the West, "shun the wretch who dares to take the land from which another is evicted as you would a leper. Hold no communication with him whatever. If his wife and children lie sick unto death, you must bring him no relief. Nay, if the house over their heads were burning as they lay in slumber all unconscious of their danger, you must not give them warning so that they might save their lives." And, adds Mr. Pigott, this really is a fair reflection of the spirit which took possession of the farming classes as the result of this ruthless agitation.—Pigott's *Recollections, etc., etc.*, p. 405.

What can your English readers think of a system of which this precious extract is considered to supply a "fair reflection"?

Here are the sentiments of another Roman Catholic priest :—

The Rev. Mr. Beahan, on the occasion of the declaration of the poll at the election for North Dublin, said that Castle officials with distended abdomens would have to go. It was time for them to be on the run. They (the Nationalists) were not struggling merely for a green flag, they wanted three meals a day, good clothes on their backs and employment for honest men. The election was over, and the real struggle was to begin now. What they wanted was the spoil—the loaves and fishes of all those fellows who had had the monopoly up to this. They wanted men of their own to be officials of this country, to fill every situation and every occupation that they were qualified for, from the highest to the lowest—the topmost man in the Castle must make way for one of theirs, and the lowest official in the poorhouse yonder must make place for one of them. What did their opponents do in their days. They kept everything to themselves, and now they might thank God if they (the Nationalists) "gave them raw and unboiled justice."

The following extract from a paper by James Stephens, the Fenian Head Centre, recently published in *Hibernia* needs no comment :—

Mr. Parnell, speaking in Cork some time ago, said that no man had a right to fix or circumscribe the limits of a nation's onward march ; and more recently still, when an English statesman asked for guarantees that Ireland would not struggle for complete separation after Repeal of the Union had been accorded to her, he replied that such guarantees were out of the question, for he had none to give. He is certainly justified in the attitude he has taken up on this question ; for neither Mr. Parnell nor any other man could go surety for the future good

behaviour of the Irish people—speaking from the English point of view—when once they had a Parliament of their own in College Green.

The miserable West-British element apart, there are in Ireland no two ways of thinking when the question of the rights and privileges of this Parliament is considered. Everyone is anxious to see in Dublin a legislature worthy of the Irish nation—a legislature that shall not be a mere *succursale* to Westminster, but one that shall have as much authority over the essentially internal affairs of our country as Westminster has over the purely internal affairs of Great Britain. What the Irish people are determined to have sooner or later—and the sooner the better for both countries—is the complete control of the internal administration of their island—complete control over the land and the customs which their representatives would elect to establish, as well as over the police and magistracy, and all other officials save those connected with the British army and navy. To simplify the question as much as possible, it is only necessary to observe that Ireland aims just now at attaining a position analogous to that occupied by Hungary in the Austrian, or by Canada in the British, Empire.

Here is Mr. Froude's opinion, and few men have devoted more attention to Irish questions than he :—

Home Rule under the Queen's sovereignty is impossible. The administration of Ireland under a Local Parliament returned by household suffrage would be the transfer of authority to those who are now terrorising the western counties.

Again :—

The land tenure is not the real grievance, it is merely the pretext. The real grievance is our presence in Ireland at all.—Froude's *English in Ireland*, Vol. III., Supp. Chap. London, 1881.

If this opinion be compared with that of James Stephens, it will be seen that the English historian is substantially in agreement with the Fenian chief, and the following extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Parnell in Cincinnati during his American tour proves that he too is at one with the Fenians on this point :—

None of us—whether we are in America, or in Ireland, or wherever we may be—will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England.

Here, then, is the Irish demand ; not "local chambers," not a sham Parliament, but absolute independence. Once more I ask, Is England prepared to pay the price? The importance of this subject must plead my excuse for having unduly occupied your space. I appeal with confidence to your English readers to study the extracts given in this letter, and then to answer the question, Is England prepared to pay the price? Can she give up the party in this land who through evil report and good report have been loyal, industrious, law-abiding, and who even yet cannot help believing that deep down in the heart of the stout old Saxon race there is a chord that when touched vibrates to the old watch-words—Honour and Duty. It has been said, *usque ad nauseam*, that England never will consent to separation. We know that. We know that she cannot and dare not. But we know that to loyal men in Ireland of all creeds and classes there is an evil worse than separation—the evil of being bound hand and foot, and handed over to the enemies of the Empire. We dread the repetition of the policy enacted by the men of Judah at the rock Etam. But what is to be done? If England even now would give up her policy of paying black-mail to rebels, of removing grievances not because they are grievances, but because men threaten dynamite and rebellion unless they are conciliated, and would rule our land wisely, firmly, and justly, seeking inspiration neither from Romish bishop nor from Protestant sources, but dealing true justice and fair play equally to all, and promoting Irishmen to place and trust when they deserved promotion, all might yet be well. Between this course and Irish independence I see no half-way house, and time shall prove whether this view is correct or not.

THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.

The Vicarage, Warrenpoint.

## EMIGRATION.

SIR,—Allow me to thank you for your kindness in giving so much space to my last letter on emigration. I am going to ask your indulgence again. I ask your permission to say a few words to "working men." Why choose the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT? Well, because the expression of clerical opinion is seized on for better or for worse approval or animadversion by "working men," as I know, for their opinions have been forwarded to me.

In the first place, I am opposed to the common cry raised in favour of emigration. Secondly, I am not opposed to emigration—very contradictory! Let me explain. The cry of emigration is raised at times in a way and in a spirit which I think should be opposed. The idea, widely spread, is that large Government aid should be given for this object. In my former letter I endeavoured to show from practical knowledge that "the right men and the right place" are the first objects worthy of thought. No Government aid can avail if these points are not put first and foremost. But, you say, is the rejoinder, you are opposed to emigration. What I mean is this : the working classes are being ill advised for their own interests and for the interests of our country, when Messrs. Arch, Hyndman, Burns, Champion, &c., tell them to stand out for eight hours work at sixpence an hour. England is suffering in a terrible depression of trade from two causes ; Free Trade all on our side, and the economic living, and lower wages prevailing in Belgium, France, Germany. No legislation can alter the higher and more comfortable ways of living, now so general amongst the working classes. No one, I hope, would wish operatives to be put back to the conditions of life prevalent fifty years ago. Comfort is one thing, extravagance and utter absence of management and thrift are another. The foreign operative and field labourer has not the same comforts which the English mechanic and labourer has ; but in personal requirements and in the management of his home, the Englishman and English wife are far behind the foreigner.

In every grade of society in England, in the higher classes and middle classes there is less coming in and more to be done in individual work. The English gentleman works harder, his sons have to be educated and then go out to do what they can in a colony, or ride a desk with small pay at home, or enlist as soldiers ; the middle-class tradesman has to adjust his profits to expenditure, for the one is decreasing and he must cut down the other.

The leaders of the "working classes" are getting into Parliament ; by all means let them. How are they using their position to delude the working classes and to increase our trade depression. Are "the working classes" to have no part in trying to adjust wages to trade? are the upper classes and the middle classes to do this without any corresponding effort on the part of mechanics and labourers, in eating and drinking by the men, and fine dressing by wives and daughters? In place of agitators going in for shorten-

ing hours and increasing wages, let them face bravely the whole condition of our country; recommending mechanics and labourers to put in better work, honest work; not how little they can do badly done, but how much they can do and well done. Fifty years ago no one could believe that a time would come when such tyranny would prevail as we see now, I mean in trade unions forbidding a mechanic to do his best to earn all he could for his own and his family's benefit. People who carry out principles which interfere with the energy of the individual workman need not go further still in injuring him, by telling him to emigrate. Alter all that, ye representatives of labour (?). Let the leaders of the working classes give very different advice as to individual work and honest work and hours for work. If they will do this, trade depression might be much relieved; many good fellows and their good wives might still do well at home, and find their lot in the course of years quite as happy and prosperous as if they had emigrated; therefore, I am opposed to the cry of emigration by the representatives of labour where so many might do well in England if they were not ill advised, and if they would only buckle to and live reasonably under altered conditions of income all round.

Secondly, so far from opposing emigration, I would do all in my power to aid it where it can help mechanics or labourers, and specially where the locality in which they live is overcrowded; but this outcry for "Government-aided emigration" will not meet their needs. Let us advocate Government-aided emigration in ways in which the national aid can be expended wisely and well. I mean by sending out a number of families, carefully selected, to places where they have a good chance of succeeding, with time and patience and perseverance allowed as requisites. Such was the Phœnician, Roman and Greek method of colonisation, and they were most successful. In this way the want of individual capital is met by the presence of those who can help on others, payment for needful helpful aid, is made by barter and exchange; by degrees this will give place to ordinary currency. Living by barter and exchange is still carried on in the upper parts of Cape Colony. As matters are managed now, the emigrant who "goes away out back" is terribly handicapped in the absence of capital; few such emigrants can "turn their hands to anything," and the skilled mechanic or the ordinary labourer who has lived a life of dependency on mutual co-operation in handicraft and labour, finds himself "landed" with a vengeance. The issue is too frequent; he leaves his first settlement, and betakes himself to some colonial town, to increase his own trouble and that of others in an overstocked labour market.

In such very old-fashioned ways of colonising, as I have mentioned, there would be I fancy sympathy, interest, fine spirit shown, by clergy and medical men joining in it. Young clergy and young medical men would not be found wanting in such enterprises; younger sons, with a little parental help, might do better abroad than they can expect to do at home, in joining such a very old-fashioned colonisation scheme; their chances of settling down in married life happily, would be increased; for, they would find, "the girl they left behind them" not unwilling to join hands for life partnership, when the question was proposed by good fellows who were bravely paddling their own canoe, and who could offer a reasonable prospect of happiness, a "settlement" apart from lawyers.

There are serious "questions of the day"—not immediately connected with the "working classes," such as the increasing difficulty of young men and young women, in the upper and middle classes marrying—and these questions are no laughing matter; they are far too serious to be ignored. The conditions of English civilisation and requirements are such, that the younger generation are being more and more precluded from marrying. Sensible men, men really thoughtful over some very trying considerations connected with this subject, will fill up for themselves what I need not enlarge on.

Your columns, sir, have been opened to these questions, one and all, with unusual liberality and a commendable desire to help the best interests of our nation spiritually and morally, which your readers I hope value. This last subject, to which I have referred the happiness and well-being of our risen manhood and womanhood, is part and parcel of emigration. The author of "Tom Brown" has shown us an example in colonisation and emigration. If his project was not perfectly successful at first, it only proved the need of great care in choosing the proper place as well as the proper people.

I trust nothing I have said in my former letter or this, will be taken amiss by good sensible men and women of the mechanic and labouring classes. Their worse friends and leaders are those who flatter and deceive them, on such matters as emigration, labour, trade depression. Those are not their worst friends who respect them, by endeavouring to speak and write from practical experience, who believe in their own ideas and suggestions, until better knowledge and experience can come forward and gainsay them

A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, Gloucestershire, February 27th, 1886.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT FROM THE GROVES OF BLARNEY.

SIR,—I observe in Mr. Gurney's letter on "The Irish and British Question" the words: "Local chambers in Dublin would mean a total cessation of agitation, establishment of good will between landlords and tenants, payment of rents, and collapse of expropriation." Fudge! BURCHELL.

## Reviews and Notices.

"THE MONTHLY INTERPRETER." March, 1886. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

PROFESSOR REYNOLDS' paper on the Omissions from the Fourth Gospel, though one of the shortest, is yet almost the best in this month's *Interpreter*. The paper only deals with three omissions,—the omission of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, the omission of the Agony, and the omission of the Ascension. But the author of the Fourth gospel was more concerned with the significance of facts than with their exact details, when they were already well known. And the sixth chapter shows the significance of the Lord's Supper; and again the Apocalypse which preceded the Gospel is itself a record of the work of the Ascended Christ.

Mr. Deane has a second paper on the Difficulties of Scripture, dealing principally with the Creation and Fall of man, and the Deluge. Mr. Deane accepts in the main the narrative in a literal sense, except that he regards the Deluge as only partial. Discussing

the difficult question of the rejection of Cain's, and the acceptation of Abel's sacrifice, he inclines to the view that Cain's was rejected because it was nothing but a thank-offering, while Abel's was propitiatory. But this is purely conjecture, and to translate "If thou doest not well, sin (*i.e.* a sin-offering) croucheth at the door" seems to us against the usage of חַטָּאת. Mr. Deane himself feels this difficulty and says: "Moses might naturally use the term with which he was familiar." But this explanation makes Moses not only record, but also invent, the history. On the "Sons of God and daughters of men" passage, Mr. Deane rejects the theory that the former means the angels. Here we quite agree with him, but we cannot possibly accept the translation, "Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his *little* son had done unto him" to mean his "grandson," Canaan. We have looked, but can find no precedent for בֵּן הַקָּטָן, meaning a grandson. Can Mr. Deane give us one?

Dr. Matheson has a very good paper on the Exaltation of Christ in the Epistle to the Philippians, and Canon Rawlinson an introduction to the Book of Isaiah. But we have always found that wondrous book more interesting than any introduction.

THE Bishop of Pretoria has sailed for South Africa with some fresh workers. He recently preached at St. Michael's, Highgate, on behalf of his Mission field in the Transvaal, which is a very scattered one.

ON the 28th ult. a serious fire occurred at Wateringbury Church, Kent, the steeple of which was entirely destroyed; but a fire-engine from Maidstone arrived in time to save the remainder of the church. One of the firemen was severely injured.

A PORTRAIT of the Bishop of Chester, which has been subscribed for by his friends in Oxford, has been placed in the Bodleian Library. It is painted by Professor Herkomer, and forms a valuable addition to the art treasures of Oxford. The Bishop is represented in his ordinary dress, seated in an easy and characteristic attitude, as though engaged in conversation. The expression is most happy, and does full justice to the humour and kindliness that were seldom absent from the Bishop's face. The portrait will be exhibited next summer in the Royal Academy.

WE understand that the new Vicar of Leeds will be Canon Joshua Ingham Brooke, M.A., Rector of Thornhill, Dewsbury, and Proctor in Convocation. He took a good degree at Oxford, and was ordained priest in 1862. He is considered one of the successful parish priests in Yorkshire, and is a very earnest extempore preacher. His mother was an Ingham of Hunslet, and it was through the munificence of her brother, Mr. Ingham, of Palermo, that Hunslet parish church was rebuilt. Mr. Brooke is a son of the late Mr. Brooke, of Honley, and brother to Captain Brooke, the late defeated Conservative candidate for Huddersfield, cousin to Prebendary Brooke, rector of Hackney, and son-in-law to the late Bishop of London. Mrs. Ingham Brooke is a daughter of Colonel Godby, who did great service in India for many years. Canon Ingham Brooke succeeded to a large fortune both from his father and Mr. Ingham, of Palermo. His good deeds and those of the Brooke family are too well known to require comment here.—*Leeds Daily News.*

Messrs. Graves and Miller have sold by auction four pews in Banbury parish church, and they realised £26, £30, £22, and £83 respectively.—*Oxford Journal.*

THE Pusey Library at Oxford is now available for the use of all members of the University, the process of arranging and cataloguing the books having occupied a long time. It is almost exclusively theological, and consists chiefly of Biblical Texts and Commentaries, Dogmatic Theology, and the works of the principal Schoolmen, Ecclesiastical History and Conciliar Literature, and Hebrew Philology. No department of the library can be said to be in any way complete; but it is especially rich in German theology up to the middle of the present century. Those who are not members of the University can obtain permission to use the library on application to the Principal.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Airy, Rev. Basil Reginald, M.A., Vicar of Whitwell, Yorkshire; Vicar of St. John's, Torquay.
Aston, Rev. William Clifford, M.A., Rector of Beeston St. Andrew, Norfolk.
Belcher, Rev. T. W., D.D., Vicar of St. Faith's, Stoke Newington; Rector of Frampton Cotterell.
Boughton-Leigh, Rev. T. C., Curate of St. Mark's, Reigate.
Bowman, Rev. A. H., Association Secretary of the Church Missionary Society for the South-Western District.
Cadman, Rev. J. M., Curate of St. George's, Bloomsbury; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Newington.
Collier, Rev. C., Vicar of Andover; Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral.
Coombs, Rev. H. L. G., M.A., Curate of St. Augustine's, Bristol; Vicar of St. Mark's, Devonport.
Davies, Rev. Gabriel John, Vicar of Helidon, Northamptonshire.
Denny, Rev. E., M.A., Vicar of Kempley, Gloucestershire.
Edwards, Rev. Evan Jones, Vicar of Tremeirchion.
Ellis, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Twyford-cum-Hungarton and Thorpe Satchville, Leicestershire.
Hillersden, Rev. Frederick Harcourt, M.A., Vicar of Bole with Saundby, Notts.
Holbeach, Rev. H., Rector of Whittington, Salop.
Landon-Smith, Rev. Walter, B.A., Rector of St. Luke's, Chorlton-upon-Medlock.
Lloyd, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of Brimscombe.
Pixell, Rev. C. H. V., M.A., Rector of Frampton Cotterell; Vicar of St. Faith's, Stoke Newington.
Tatlock, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Trimingham, Norfolk.
Tomlinson, Rev. T. G., Vicar of Cantley.
Usherwood, Ven. T. E., late Archdeacon of Maritzburg; Chaplain to the Firs Home, Bournemouth.
Walthew, Rev. J. H., Incumbent of Christ Church, Richmond, Surrey; Vicar of St. Philip's, Kennington Road, S.E.
Wright, Rev. Josiah, M.A., Vicar of Sutton-upon-Trent, Notts.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Hodgson, Rev. Walter Cotton, M.A., eighteen years Rector of Swepston-cum-Snarestone, at 13, Green Street, Park Lane, on the 23rd ult., aged 58.
May, Rev. R. C., M.A., Chaplain of the Central London Sick Asylum, Cleveland Street, at 73, Dartmouth Park Hill, on the 27th ult., aged 54.
Moore, Ven. Joseph Christian, M.A., forty-two years Rector of Andreas, and Archdeacon of Man, at the Rectory, on the 26th ult., aged 83.
Scovil, Rev. William, M.A., Ph.D., Canon of Christ Church Cathedral, Fredericton, and of St. John, New Brunswick, Canada, at Brighton, suddenly, on the 27th ult., aged 70.
Smith, Rev. Joseph, B.D., formerly Bursar of Trinity College, Oxford, and Rector of Rotherfield Greys, Oxon, and late of 12, Hanover Terrace, Regent's Park, at Worthing, on the 23rd ult,, aged 91.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## SURNAMES AND CHRISTIAN NAMES.

By the Lord Bishop of PETERBOROUGH.

Sermon Preached at Peterborough, on Sunday Afternoon, February 21st, 1886.

"And he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out."—St. John x. 3.

I AM here to speak to you because you have called me to do so, not by your voices, but by the silent and powerful call of your presence. I have felt for some time, as I have made my way through this great congregation on Sunday afternoons, that it was an opportunity for me, so plain an opportunity that it amounted to a call and command, to say some few words to you that, by God's grace, might be helpful to your souls. I mean to address you this day and Sunday after Sunday at least until Easter next, and I will promise you that my words shall not be many, and that I will strive to make them simple and helpful. I purpose on those occasions dealing with some very old and some very familiar words, well known to you—those, namely, of your old Church Catechism. I do so because, in the first place, those words are familiar. Probably every one of you present knows the words of the Catechism more or less by heart, and for that very reason they are words that need, from time to time, to be examined into and explained. For it is with our old words as with our old coins. The coin that we lock up and put by does not wear out and grow indistinct, but a coin that is constantly circulated and passed from hand to hand every day is sure to get blurred, and its image and inscription to grow dim and worn out. What do we do with those coins? After they have grown hardly discernible we call them in, and issue them again bright and fresh—the same metal cleaned up and made bright—and it should be the same with your familiar words—which are so much in use that you forget their meaning. It is a good thing, from time to time, to call in a word or two, and re-burnish and clean them, and make them fresh and clear for fresh use. I am going to do this with some of the words of your old Church Catechism. The Catechism begins, as you are all aware, with the question, "What is your name?" You are asked that question at the commencement. That word "name" seems to take it for granted that each of you has only one name. When you answer that question you repeat the name given you by your Godfathers and Godmothers as if you had no other name. Now, you have not only the Christian name that was given you in your baptism, but a surname. Is it that the surname is not your true name, and that the Christian name is the only true one you have? Is the Church right? Undoubtedly so, for the surname really means the over-name, or the extra name. The word surname comes from the French (*surnom*), or the extra name. The surname is not a real name. You can change that to-morrow if you wish, with proper legal formalities, and you can give yourselves a new surname, but you cannot give yourselves a new Christian name, for the Christian name abideth with you for life. After giving proper notice signing a deed with your new surname would be a legal act, but if you signed it with a different Christian name it would not be a legal act. The surname is an overname or nick-name added to the Christian name. Surnames were names drawn from the appearances and occupations of your predecessors. The true and real name of a man is the one given him at baptism. This teaches us that the truest and most real of all things are spiritual. It teaches that the relations which each one enters into with God his Father in his baptism are abiding and eternal things, and that all other things compared with these are unreal and passing away. What a man is now and what he is to be for ever is a very real thing. The true name is the Christian name, because the Christian life is the true life and the Christian verities the great verities, for things which are seen are transient and passing away, but things which are not seen are eternal.

In the second place, the Christian name is not only the true name, but the distinguishing name of each one. Those who are members of the same family have a common surname, but when they want to distinguish the different members they have resort to the Christian name, and it is by that name that members of a family are known from each other. It is a remarkable thing to remember that for a long time in the history of man distinguishing names were not known, and men were called by the name of the family, of the tribe, or of the clan, and members of some clans even in the present day all have the common surname. What is the meaning of that? It represents that very sad and significant fact that there was a time in human history when the individual man or woman was little thought of or cared for in comparison to the race or nation. In those days when a little child was born into the world they took it to the father. For what? To see whether it was to live or not. If he took it up into his arms it was to live, but if not it was cast away. The race was everything and the individual was nothing. What had wrought the change? There had come into this world the Son of God, who so loved each individual that he died for them, each one, and the moment men took that truth into their hearts it taught them that each individual

man, woman, and child, even the little one which had just drawn its first breath was infinitely precious, because Christ died for it and Christ rose for it again. You should remember when you repeat your Christian name that it testifies to the infinite work and preciousness of each individual soul in the sight of a common Father. It is a good thing to remember that preciousness of the individual, and that Christianity makes you truly men as it were, with the rights of men. It is a good thing to remember that fact, because there is a danger of the old things coming back, for we think too much of the masses instead of the individual. I do not speak disparagingly of the word masses, for it is the expression of a great truth, that the men are drawn together by the same common objects, sorrows, and aspirations. But there is another and counterbalancing truth to be set over against this—namely, that which Christianity teaches us—that each individual man and woman possesses a soul to save and a heart to feel, and no man may lawfully take away from them these rights by which the community is bound up. One thing more and I have done. Your Christian name is not only the true distinctive name, but the endearing name. Who does not know how dear a Christian name may be to each one of us? Who does not know that it is just in proportion as men come to love one another that they call one another by their Christian names, and that it would seem cold and strange to call by the surname only one whom we loved. Are there none present who know of some dear old name which comes back to the memory, and the eye fills with tears at the shadows of the past as that name trembles on the lips—that dear Christian name, the distinctive name of one who has passed away. The Christian name is one of endearment, and so it is in the high and true sense as regards Him in whose name you bear it, for he loved you with a love that passeth all understanding, each individual one by one, with that tender knowledge of your needs and sufferings which love alone can give. He calleth his own sheep by their names, and the love of Christ for his people is witnessed, thus, in the Christian names they bear. The true name, the distinctive name, the endearing name, that is the Christian name, and when next you pronounce that name in answer to that question in the old Church Catechism, think what the word means, think what fresh truth it bears for you. I hope that after this explanation you will think of your Christian name in that new light, for it expresses for you the real, the eternal, and the abiding reality of things spiritual, the distinctive independence of the soul with all the rights that Christ has given it, and the love that Christ your Saviour bore to each of you, for whom He died. Your Christian name is the utterance of Christian hope and faith; let each one see that he lives worthy of it.

## ANTAGONISM BETWEEN DOGMA AND PHILOSOPHY.

By the Rev. A. W. Momerie, M.A., D.Sc., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at King's College, London, and Preacher at the Foundling Hospital.

Paper read before the London Juinor Clergy Society, on February 9, 1886.

By Dogma, I understand a creed which claims to be final and all-comprehensive. By philosophy, I understand the progressive explanation of things.

"That is dogma," says Mr. Garbett, p. 18, in his Bampton Lectures on Dogmatic Faith; "and that alone upon which has been set the seal of the Divine infallibility." This is precisely what I do *not* mean by dogma. With the fact or the nature of the inspiration of the Scriptures I am not at all at present concerned. What I have to say against dogma is as valid on the view of plenary inspiration, as it would be if there were no such thing as inspiration at all. Dogma is not the Scriptures, but an interpretation of the Scriptures, and no interpretation can claim for itself the infallibility belonging to that which is interpreted.

The highest degree of fallibility in dogma is perfectly compatible with the highest degree of infallibility in the Scriptures. Mr. Garbett farther on, p. 20, alters his definition of dogma, as of course it was necessary for him to do, if his treatise were to be at all applicable to the subject he had in hand. He says, "I employ the word dogma for a revealed truth [that is the same use of it as before], AND for ecclesiastical formulas so far, and so far only, as they truly express the mind of God. It is a condition arising from the delivery of the faith into the charge of the saints, that the formulating of its truths, for convenience and instruction and defence, is necessarily a human work. Nor will any one deny the abstract possibility of human error in the process." So that dogmas in this second sense in the sense namely of ecclesiastical formulas, are not dogmas in the first sense,—they are not things "on which has been set the seal of the Divine infallibility."

Again, on p. 17 he says, "dogma is only another word for a positive truth, positively asserted, in contrast to an opinion, conjecture, or speculation. It is a proposition regarded as so certainly true as to be presented for acceptance, but not for discussion." On p. 19, he admits that "positiveness of statement is incongruous with what is human;" and therefore, inasmuch as the formulating of Christian truth is, according to Mr. Garbett's own confession, a human work involving abstract possibility of error, positiveness of statement is inadmissible in the case of formulæ.

Mr. Garbett's confusion between revealed truth and its interpretation is very common but most unfortunate. There are no two things which should be more carefully distinguished; otherwise authority may be claimed for both which belongs only to one, or *vice versâ*, be denied to both when it should only be denied to one. The absurdity of classing the two things together should be apparent on the hastiest glance at ecclesiastical history, for a considerable portion of that history is taken up with an account of the controversies and wranglings that arose from time to time in regard to the interpretative formulæ.

If there were *one* dogmatic system, the whole of which the believers in dogma had always embraced, and none of which they had ever disputed, we could understand its being put on the same level as revealed truth and considered infallible. It would have in its favour, if not the *consensus gentium*, yet the *consensus ecclesiæ*. But there is no such system. Dogma, which is supposed to be indisputably certain, has always been the battle-ground of the fiercest and most protracted disputes. Even the Popes, from the very chair of St. Peter, have given forth contradictory utterances.

The truth is one and the same, but there are endless differences in the interpretation of it. The Bible is "the book where each his dogma seeks and each his dogma finds." These diversified and often contradictory interpretations cannot possibly express the mind of God, in the same way and with the same authority as the one unchanging truth which they are supposed to interpret. We have Homoousianism and Homoiousianism, Arianism and Athanasianism, the expiatory and revelatory theories of the Atonement, the Romish, Lutheran, and Zwinglian view of the Eucharist, eternal punishment, annihilation, and universalism, and a hundred other incompatible doctrines, all professing to be the correct interpretation of Bible truth. Since, then, revealed truth is one and unchangeable, and the formulæ many and variable, why in the name of common sense should we class the two things together?

The distinction between the Scriptures and their interpretation is clearly recognised by our Church in the XXIst Article. "General councils when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength or authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scriptures."

By dogma, then in this paper I shall understand an interpretation of the Bible, or a humanly devised formula, as distinct from the Bible itself.

There is another distinction of very great importance, viz., the distinction between a creed and a dogma. Every dogma is a creed, but the converse is not true; every creed is not a dogma. A dogma is a creed which claims for itself an infallibility that must never be doubted, an authority that must never be gainsaid, a completeness and perfection that can never be surpassed. The sceptic flippantly despises creeds; the dogmatist slavishly cringes before them; the philosopher takes the *via media*,

> Not clinging to some ancient saw,
> Not mastered by some modern term,
> Not swift, nor slow to change, but firm;—

firm in his allegiance to the truth; so firm, that when he really finds a belief to be erroneous he will venture to discard it, no matter whose belief it may have been. A creed is a means to progress, a dogma is a barrier against progress. Dogmas, therefore, are most injurious; creeds most useful. Creeds are needed in every sphere of investigation. G. H. Lewes tells us, in his "Seaside Studies," that for years very little progress was made in zoology, because the workers in that department of science had no definite creed to guide them. There is no antagonism between philosophy and creeds; on the contrary, creeds are the handmaids of philosophy. A creed means, etymologically and really, that which is believed. It is neither more nor less than a register of results in the search for truth; it is a landmark showing the point which has been reached in the march of human thought,—a march which never can have an end. A creed consists of the opinions arrived at in a certain age by certain men on certain subjects, which they have transmitted (or ought to have transmitted) for the guidance, and not for the extinction, of future thought and investigation. It is a starting-point, not a goal. Just as an invading army (to use an illustration of Hamilton's) makes good each position gained by planting a citadel, in order that they may be better able to set forth again to larger and more certain conquests; so it is necessary that creeds should be constructed in order that men may be better prepared for making further progress into the still outstanding, still unexplored realms of truth. This is clearly recognised in the daily service of our Church which is brought to a close with the prayer of St. Chrysostom. For the words, "granting us in this world knowledge of Thy truth," dogmatists ought to substitute "granting us in this world remembrance of our creed." A creed becomes a dogma, and in becoming a dogma becomes a curse, when it sets itself up as an infallible, perfect, and ultimate exposition of truth.

Let me then ask you to bear in mind that what I say this afternoon has not the slightest reference to *creeds*, which are aids to progressive reflection and investigation. I am speaking exclusively against *dogmas*, which are confessedly incompatible with progress. Over against Aristotle's definition of Philosophy as "the art of doubting well," Dogma may be defined as the art of believing ill. Dogma believes, or tries to believe, it knows all the truth, that it may thereby avoid the trouble of seeking any. Philosophy doubts whether it knows any, in order that it may seek all. The dogmatist sums up his ignorance, stupidity and laziness under the euphemistic name of Faith. But, as Tennyson has finely said:

> There dwells more faith in honest doubt,
> Believe me, than in half the creeds.

To philosophise, or to doubt well, is to doubt, not as the Pyrrhonist, but as the Cartesian. Descartes tells us, in his tract on Method: "As I made it my business in each matter to reflect particularly upon what might fairly be doubted and prove a source of error, I gradually rooted out from my mind all the errors which had hitherto crept into it; not that in this I imitated the sceptics, who doubt only that they may doubt, and seek nothing beyond uncertainty itself; for, on the contrary, my design was simply to find ground of assurance, and cast aside the loose earth and sand, that I might reach the rock or the clay."

Philosophy is the attempt progressively to explain the words Nature, Man, and God. Philosophy says with the Apostle Paul: "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." *Impavidi progrediamur* is, or should be, the watchword of philosophers. Philosophy perceives that Truth is high as heaven, deep as hell, broad as the universe, infinite as God, everlasting as eternity. Philosophy is painfully conscious that there is—

> A deep below the deep,
> A height beyond the height.
> Our hearing is not hearing,
> And our seeing is not sight.

What would you think of an athlete who was going to run a race, and who became so enamoured of the arrangements at the first end of the course that, while

others were pressing on towards the goal, he contented himself with going round and round the starting-post. No less absurd is the man who thinks that as soon as he can repeat his creed like a parrot he has mastered truth. It is an old remark, but one as true as it is old, that truth cannot be symbolised by a circle, but rather by an infinite line. The men who think they have given the ultimate explanation of universal mystery, or of any part of it, must be either madmen or fools. In the nature of things a finite mind can never do more than approximate to a knowledge of the infinite; but, generation after generation, we ought to be getting nearer to that full and adequate knowledge which can never be actually attained. There will never come a time when we shall be able to say—

> Yet I doubt not thro' the ages one unceasing purpose runs,
> And the thoughts of men are broadened with the process of the suns.

But dogma has never understood this, and will never understand it.* "We are the people, and wisdom will die with us," say the dogmatists. "The whole of the human race, save the small minority holding our opinions, were altogether and damnably in the wrong; we, an infinitesimal minority, are altogether right.†

Dogma was once co-extensive with universal truth. It forbade original thought and research, not only in theology, but even in the physical sciences; and still, the worst of the dogmatists watch over the investigations of the physicists with the angriest jealousy. I remember a year or two ago, at Cambridge, when a University preacher suggested in the course of his sermon that, *if* the theory of evolution should ever be established, the Christian religion would not be thereby affected, two or three old dons got up and walked out of the church. Dogma had said that God made the world in one way, and *the mere supposition* that He *could* have made it in another these old gentlemen regarded as the most unpardonable heresy.

Most of the dogmatists have, however, now given up the natural sciences as a bad job. They resisted as long as they could; but they found at last that they were playing a losing game, and that their position was becoming constantly more and more ignominious. Some of them are now bold enough to say they never attacked scientific truths. Cardinal Cullen, five or six years ago, declared that the Church did not really oppose the doctrine of Galileo, but only *seemed* to oppose it. The wiser portion of the dogmatists, or, more accurately speaking, the less foolish portion, have been led, by a painful and inglorious experience, to hand over natural philosophy almost entirely to the mercy of scientific specialists. They have now intrenched themselves in the citadel of theology. This is their *dernier ressort*, and they know it. If ousted from here, it is all up with them for ever. But let us ask, have the dogmatists any more right in theology than they have anywhere else? Why should not theology, like other sciences, be content to be progressive? Why should it set itself up as the *ne plus ultra* of the knowledge of God? Theology is confessedly a human work, and can have therefore no claim to infallibility. The Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford drew attention some time ago to the danger of theology becoming stagnant, and warned theologians against resting content with the mere reproduction of the past.* But dogmatists think that theology should be stagnant, and they regard the attempt to get beyond our ancestors as a sort of exhibition of juvenile impertinence. It is a very common, but a very false, argument from analogy to maintain, that our ancestors must have known more than we can know, because they were born before us. But the reason why a father is wiser than his child (if he be wiser) is not, of course, that he was born first, but that he has lived longer, and therefore had more experience. When a child has grown up, he may be, and should be, wiser than his father; for he has had the benefit of his father's experience as well as his own. As Bacon long ago pointed out, if he who has had most experience be rightly regarded as the father of him who has had least, then WE are the fathers and grandfathers of our ancestors; for they had their experience, but not ours; we have had the benefit of both. All honour to them for the truths which they discovered. All shame to us if we do not discover more.

To do the theologians justice, they are not alone in their dogmatism. The "eternal popery of the human heart" has been exemplified even by philosophy itself—at least by something that was falsely called philosophy. Of all kinds of dogma, that of the would-be philosophers' is the worst and most unjustifiable. They, at any rate, should have known better. Philosophy professes to be the very antithesis to dogma. A dogmatist can no more be a philosopher, in the proper acceptation of the term, than a dumb man can give lessons in elocution. In so far as philosophy has become dogmatic, it has been false to itself, it has ceased to be philosophy.

Look at Aristotelianism during the Middle Ages, when the logic, and the physics, and the metaphysics of Aristotle had been exalted into dogmas. The gospel of that period was the anagram which had been made out of the name of the Stagirite:—*Aristoteles iste sol erat*. Human ambition rose no higher than to shine with a light borrowed from this "sol," in other words to be a commentator upon Aristotle. Hardly anyone dreamed of being a philosopher for himself. The circle of human knowledge was made to coincide with the discoveries of Aristotle. There is a story, very characteristic of this period, of a certain monk who had detected some spots on the sun, and who rushed to his Father Superior in the first flush of his joy to tell him of the phenomenon. The reply of his superior (so

* The spirit of the dogmatists is amusingly illustrated in Hodge's "Systematic Theology"; where the author gives the various views that have been held about the various doctrines, ending up always with what he calls the right view, which is a pleasing synonym for the less harmonious expression—Hodge's view.

† The smallness of the minority, so far from causing uneasiness to the dogmatists, is often one of their chief sources of self-congratulation. There is a story told of a man who was engaged in writing a book about sects. He was informed that in the extreme north of Scotland, there was a small denomination which was quickly dying out. He went up in search of it; and when he came to the village he was directed to the house of the leading member. The great man was not at home, but our investigator entered into conversation with the great man's wife. He said to her he had been informed that their numbers were small. "Deed aye, Sir," said the woman, "there's just meself and Jock, and I'm no so very sure of Jock."

* The theologian who is not a dogmatist but a philosopher will say with the poet:—

> Our little systems have their day,
> They have their day and cease to be;
> They are but broken lights of thee,
> And thou O Lord art *more* than they.

called) must, I should fancy, have made a cynic of that monk for the rest of his life; "My son," said the holy and silly father, "I have read through Aristotle many times, and I find no mention of any such thing; therefore, rest assured, either your glass or your vision is defective." Another of these reverend fathers refused to look through a telescope for fear he should see something which had never been observed by Aristotle.* As late as 1624 the Parliament of Paris issued a decree banishing all who publicly maintained theses against Aristotle. In 1629 it was decreed that to contradict the principles of Aristotle was to contradict the Church; and we know what that meant in those days. When Ramus solicited the permission of Beza to teach in Geneva, he was told "the Genevese had decreed once for all that, neither in logic nor in any other branch of knowledge, will they depart from the principles of Aristotle, *ne tantillum quidem ab Aristotelis sententiâ deflectere.*" Gentlemen, I believe that had not a few giant souls burst the chains with which the disciples of Aristotle had loaded mankind, things would soon have come to such a pass, that the whole of human life would have been regulated according to what was or was not contained in that philosopher's writings; that all opinions, however unimpoptant in themselves, would have been considered heretical and therefore indictable, that all actions however trifling would have been accounted criminal, and therefore punishable, unless something could be found in Aristotle to justify them; so that at last a man would have stood a good chance of being expatriated for an inadvertent gape, or hanged for an untimely laugh, unless he could have proved by quotations from Aristotle the legitimacy of those relaxations. In fact the Stagirite, poor man, through no fault of his own, but through the folly of his disciples in converting him into a dogma, was very nearly becoming the father of a universal reign of humbug.

Look again at Positivism, or rather Comteism. What brilliant originality and intellectual stimulus there was in Comte's earlier writings. But the later development of his system became (and justly) a laughing stock to his enemies and a mournful sorrow to his friends. Why? Just because the later development was dogmatic. It was to be decided by priests of Positivism what theories the common people were to believe, and what subjects the men of science were to investigate. The High Priest of Humanity proposed to saddle the world, to quote Professor Huxley's expression, with a sort of Roman Catholicism *minus* Christianity.

The radical defect of Hegelianism, too, seems to me to lie in its professed comprehensiveness and finality. I believe there is more to be learned from Hegel than from any preceding philosopher; I believe that Hegel is to be to be the philosopher of the future; but his system, *as a system*, seems to me to carry on the face of it its own condemnation, because it claims to be a complete explanation of the universe.

History teems with instances of the enervating and demoralising effects which theological dogma has exercised not only upon the ignoble and ignorant, but even upon the wisest and noblest of men. I may mention an instance or two taken almost at random. The work of Copernicus, at which he had laboured thirty years in the quiet leisure of his prebendal stall at Frauenburg, was published after his death, and edited by Professor Ossiander who, in the customary preface which he added, represented the whole doctrine as a hypothesis,—in spite of the scientific form in which Copernicus had left it, and the superfluity of proof with which he had supported it.

Descartes, through fear of the clergy, recalled his completely finished work and submitted it to a thorough revision. Against his better convictions, he withdrew from it his theory of the revolution of the earth.

Fear of the Church, increased by so many a stake and *auto da fe* led to a good deal of unphilosophical, not to say dishonest, hedging. An effort after liberty of thought was, in the Middle Ages, made by the suggestion of two-fold truth, philosophical and theological, which may exist side by side in spite of their entire contradiction. In this way thinkers managed to keep on good terms with dogma. *E.g.*, Occam practically threw the whole of theology overboard by declaring its doctrines incapable of proof; but theoretically he saved it by an appeal to faith,—and saved himself along with it. A teacher at Paris, Jean de Brescans, excused himself in 1247 for his "errors," by observing that he had maintained the heretical doctrines only as philosophically, not theologically, true. Descartes introduced his account of the development of the world from small particles with the observation, that of course God had created the world at one time, but that it was very interesting to see how the world might have developed itself, although we know it had not really done so.

The introduction of the improved Gregorian Kalendar was opposed by the Protestant clergy merely because this correction had proceeded from the Catholic Church. The Senate of Tübingen justified their opposition by the irrational reason that Christ cannot be at one with Antichrist.

Kepler was warned by the Consistory in Stuttgart, that he must subdue his too speculative spirits and govern himself in all things according to the Word of God, and leave the Church of the Lord Christ untroubled by his unnecessary subtleties, scruples and glosses.

Under the influence of dogma, Malebranche professed to believe in an objective existence of matter, which was quite incompatible with the rest of his philosophical principles; because if he had not done so the doctrine of Transubstantiation would have fallen to the ground. Under the influence of dogma, Bacon and Pascal said, in almost the same words, the more absurd and *incredible* [*i.e.*, unbelievable] any divine mystery is, the greater honour we do God in *believing* it.

Under the influence of dogma, Hobbes, whose theory was near to open Atheism, who in an Atheistic State would have had any citizen hanged if he taught the existence of a God, who explains the difference between religion and superstition in this way—"Fear of power invisible feigned by the mind or imagined by tales, publicly allowed is religion; not allowed, superstition;" under the influence of dogma Hobbes uttered in his "Human Nature" the following pious cant, "Seeing our Faith that the Scriptures are the Word of God, began from the confidence and trust we repose in the Church, there can be no doubt but that their interpretation of the same Scriptures,

* A certain professor of philosophy in Padua came to Galileo, and requested that he would explain to him the meaning of the word parallax, which he said he wished to refute, having heard that it was opposed to Aristotle's doctrine touching the relative situation of the earth. What glorious confidence in oneself, to be prepared to controvert a word even when one does not know what it means!

where any doubt or controversy shall arise, is *safer* for any man to trust to, than his own reasoning or spirit, *i.e.*, than his own opinion."

Under the influence of dogma Galileo recanted, The holy Inquisition—as it called itself with an unconscious irony that its bitterest enemies could not have surpassed—the holy Inquisition threatened and terrified the venerable sage until they forced him into perjury. Clothed in the sackcloth of a repentant criminal, Galileo fell on his knees before the assembled cardinals, and, laying his hand on the Gospels invoked the Divine aid in abjuring and detesting the doctrine of the earth's motion, and vowing never again to teach it. "In surveying the melancholy picture" says Sir David Brewster "it is difficult to decide whether religion or philosophy was most degraded. While we witness the presumtuous priest pronouncing infallible the decrees of his own erring judgment, we see the high-minded philosopher abjuring the eternal and immutable truths which he himself had the glory of establishing."

Dogma perpetrates its iniquities in the name of religion; it cannot be wondered at, therefore, that by Lucretius, Swinburne, and others the two should be invariably confounded. You remember how Lucretius speaks of the hideous face of religion (I. 61); you remember, too, his often-quoted line: "To so many evils has religion persuaded man," These and all other maledictions that have been, or can ever be, uttered are *less* than the *due* of Dogma.

Thousands and tens of thousands of martyrs have proved their devotion to truth by the eloquent testimony of anguish. Because they refused to be false to their convictions they were "stoned, were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword. They were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection. They had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings; yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment. They wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; dwelt in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth; being destitute, afflicted, tormented: of whom the world was not worthy."

There has been no prophet, nor apostle, nor philosopher, nor reformer whom Dogma has not execrated; against whom it has not howled out the accusation, which the Ephesians brought against St. Paul, that the world was being turned by him upside down. The very truisms of one age were often regarded in the preceding generation as impious blasphemies, justly punished by fines and imprisonment, by torture and death:

> For all the past of time reveals
> A bridal dawn of thunder peals,
> Whenever thought hath wedded fact.

Let me call to your minds one or two familiar illustrations. Anaxagoras, after the early Greek philosophers had long groped in vain for a First Cause, which they fancied was to be found in the principles of water, air, or fire—Anaxagoras saw and said that the origin of all things must ultimately be traced to Intelligence. This his countrymen could not tolerate; it was too novel, too absurd. Private judgment must be punished, they said, when it wandered so far from the truth; so he was banished from Greece, and had a narrow escape of death. Socrates, who was the first to perceive that morality must be something deeper, something altogether different, from expediency,—Socrates, whose conceptions of Duty were too lofty to tally with the childish orthodoxy of his contemporaries,—Socrates, who was brave enough to express the memorable utterance, "I will venture to be true to my convictions though all the world oppose it,"—Socrates, the purest, the wisest, the noblest of men, was accused, forsooth, of being an Atheist and of corrupting the young, and was despatched with a cup of hemlock. Giordano Bruno, one of the subtlest thinkers of the Middle Ages, suggested the hypothesis that our earth was not the only abode of life in the universe. For this he was arrested and burnt at the stake, according to the words of the writ, "for the maintenance and welfare of the holy Church and the rights and liberties of the same." Dogma branded Spinosa with the name of Atheist; whereas the real fault of his system is, that he completely loses his own individual personality in the Divine: as Hegel put it: "there is too much of God in Spinosa." Dogma embittered the lives of Frederick Maurice and Frederick Robertson, because they were too pure to acquiesce in all the meannesses and superstitions then current in the Church. But the crowning iniquity of dogma is this—it crucified Jesus of Nazareth because His life was too sublime, too divine, to tally with orthodox Pharisaism.

Well, then, gentlemen; I maintain that Philosophy and Dogma are as opposite as light and darkness; ARE, in fact, light and darkness. One can only exist by the displacement of the other. In proportion as a man is under the influence of dogma, so far will he be destitute of the philosophical spirit; in proportion as a man is a philosopher, so far will he be opposed to dogma. The conflict between Dogma and Philosophy—between the "art of doubting well" and the art of believing ill—is a hand-to-hand, life-and-death struggle. Sometimes in the past the one has been victorious and sometimes the other; sooner or later one will be destroyed. I think the signs of the times warrant us in saying that that one will *not* be Philosophy. The right of private judgment, which was demanded at the Reformation for Protestants as a body, is being every day increasingly claimed by individual Protestants for themselves. Dogma has described for itself a little circle, a VERY little circle, gentlemen, and it has fortified itself in this enclosure with the bulwarks of anathemas and the threatenings of hell. It has said defiantly to the waves of human thought and human progress: "Hitherto shall ye come, but HERE shall ye be stayed." It has wandered ROUND and ROUND and ROUND in its narrow sphere, rejoicing in its narrowness and glorying in its shame. As the tide of progress has been beaten back now and again by the strength of its bulwarks, it has laughed its low, diabolical laugh, and has imagined itself perpetually, eternally victorious. But it is greatly mistaken. Make the most of thy life, O Dogma! *for tomorrow thou shalt die!* The tide of human progress, lashed into fury by thy constant opposition, shall gather itself up in its giant strength for another and, this time, a successful effort, and once for all shall sweep thee from off the face of the earth, with all thy follies and superstitions, thine atrocities, and thy crimes!

---

WE have received an admirable letter from "Justitia" concerning Mr. Winans and his maligners. We regret that want of space prevents our inserting it, as we think Mr. Winans is in the right, and performs a real service to the community by enforcing his rights and preventing others from backing out of their executed contracts.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 13, 1886.

## CHURCH PATRONAGE.—I.

### THE MORAL ASPECT OF THE QUESTION.

CHURCH patronage is, at present, the great question of the day in ecclesiastical politics. It occupied much time and attention in the Houses of Convocation of Canterbury and York, and nothing else was discussed in Archbishop Benson's new House of Laymen. It is a question of immense importance, and under the impulse given to men's minds by recent political changes, it is fast maturing for decision. But the minds of those who have been lately engaged in the discussion of it display a very remarkable state of confusion. Considerations, moral, social and material, are mixed together, so as to destroy all clearness of view, and decisiveness of action. We propose to attempt to disentangle these confused ideas, and to refer them to their proper departments—the moral, the social, and the material.

Let us put before us, without any circumlocution, the crucial question—Is the sale of Church Preferment a moral offence or not?

We may note, in reply, that in the case of every office, secular or religious, except the pastoral charge of a parish, the offer of a money inducement to the person who has the disposal of it is treated as self-evident moral corruption. If, for example, it had been proposed by Lord Westbury, to sell the *jus advocationis* of any of the legal offices in his gift, in the way in which the ecclesiastical benefices were sold under his Act, so that the purchaser might present any qualified barrister, the proposal would have been rejected as immoral, as well as contrary to public policy. If, again, it were proposed to make medical offices, conveying definite public responsibilities, such as those in the army and navy, in hospitals, asylums, unions, etc., saleable, so that the *jus advocationis* might be at the disposal of any practitioner who had passed the qualifying examinations, on his payment of its money value, this too would be stigmatised as an immoral proposal. Again, a candidate who obtains a seat in Parliament by purchasing the votes of the electors, who possess in common the *jus advocationis* to the Parliamentary seat, is held to have committed a flagitious action which deprives him of his seat; and the voters who have received money for their votes are held guilty of a misdemeanour, punishable by a term of imprisonment, and by exclusion from the political rights of citizenship. Even in the case of military offices, promotion by purchase was looked upon as a scandal, which must at any price be abolished. It was not merely held to be inexpedient or impolitic, but unjust and immoral. In all these cases, except perhaps the last named, the instinctive moral sense pronounces the offer or the acceptance of a money consideration for the gift or receipt of a public office, or for the performance or non-performance of a public duty, to be self-evidently immoral. Of this there can be no question whatever. On what possible grounds, then, can it be maintained that an action universally held to be immoral when applied to offices dealing with the common concerns of this life, at once loses its immorality when applied to what are supposed to be the most sacred offices of all?

Let us consider some of the excuses and defences which are made, which we venture to maintain are only subterfuges.

A quasi-defence is sometimes made by enlarging on the inapplicability of the term Simony. We remember a writer supposing himself to have made a strong point when he had said, alluding to the name and act of Simon Magus, that the sale of preferments was no more Simony than it was Magic. Of course, the use of this name is of no importance, and, if it is ambiguous, it is better to drop it altogether. The point that we maintain is not that the sale of Church preferment is rightly expressed by the word Simony, but that such sale is an immoral act.

Others have thought it to be a valid defence to say that sale of preferment is not "selling souls," a rhetorical expression which we believe is sometimes used, and which certainly will not stand the test of a rigid definition of the meaning of the words employed. The fact that an incorrect or unsuitable expression has been used does not in any way affect the morality of the question. The real point at issue is whether the sale of the right of appointing to a spiritual office is immoral or not.

A distinction is sometimes made between the office and the opportunity of exercising that office, the former being said to be only the priesthood or presbyterate, and the latter the particular pastoral charge. The first of these is held, by those who seek for arguments in defence of this traffic, to be a spiritual gift, and the latter to be none. If so, how low and degrading an idea must be entertained of that connection between pastor and flock, which is, to those who look on it as a gift of God, so true a vocation, and so real a spiritual marriage, which only some imperious call may induce a man to break. If there be any

spiritual gift on earth, the call to tend certain particular individual souls, with all the responsibilities which it involves towards those souls, is one of the most sacred that exists.

We earnestly hope that our readers will begin their study of this question of patronage by making up their minds thoroughly upon the moral nature of the purchase and sale of preferment in any shape and form. Let them consider that an act against which the public conscience has pronounced in connection with all secular offices, cannot be morally right in connection with spiritual ones. And having once made up their minds on this point, do not let them become confused again amongst the various questions of social influence, material advantage, or political expediency, with which the substance of the matter is sometimes overlaid. We shall enter into the other subsidiary branches of the subject in their turn, but we will say at the outset that for us the morality of the subject is *everything*, and so it is also for the bulk of the people of England, and so it ought to be for the Church herself.

## THRIFT.

INASMUCH as next to the Christian faith and its moral and sanitary observances we hold that Industrial Savings' Banks are the most powerful levers for elevating the working classes, we desire to direct the attention of our readers to the gigantic facts and figures of the report and balance-sheet of the PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY, for the year 1885, as given in our advertising columns. If our abstaining bishops and teetotal clergymen would spend a tithe of the zeal and oratory, which they now display against the consumption of wine, beer, and other good gifts of God, in the promotion of Life Assurance and Deferred Annuities for old age amongst the wage-earning classes, they would achieve a far greater and more permanent success in the crusade against the drink traffic, and the much maligned public-houses. For undertaking such an evangel as this, which is in accordance with the spirit and letter of Christ's teaching, the gigantic and ever-growing figures of this balance-sheet afford a safe and sure omen of success. In the Industrial branch of this company, the premiums collected in pence from the working classes during the year, amounted to £2,794,522 against £2,644,516 in 1884, being an increase of £150,006. The distribution of £1,069,878 in the year, amongst the widows and orphan children of the artizans and labourers, is an eloquent fact, which shows that the British workman is able and willing to "provide for those of his own house." Scripture stigmatises all who neglect this duty as practical "deniers of the faith and worse than infidels," it is surely not unbecoming for the clergy to promote the fulfilment of this sacred duty, even if, in order to succeed, they have to act as advocates and agents for the Government and other sound Assurance Companies.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### THE CAUSE OF ALL OUR SOCIAL MISERY.

SIR,—You will allow me to abstain from further comments at present on the Irish Question, the formal solution of which must be left to party-leaders. The alarming riots in London, Manchester, Leicester, Reading, and other places, Birmingham not the least, call trumpet-tongued for reconsideration of our fiscal policy. Emigration, as recommended by your correspondent and my good friend Mr. Pringle, is, at best, a palliative, no real remedy for our national troubles We cannot send abroad all the highest physical energy of the nation. Poor Ireland has got rid of some three millions in the course of the last twenty years, and seems over-populated still, because she can find no market for her agricultural produce.

The source of nine-tenths of our national suffering is the policy of free trade, of which it is difficult to speak with ordinary patience. No priest or minister of the Church of God who loves the people, can think with patience of the truly monstrous folly, which opens our markets to all foreign labour and its products, and thereby crowds our own working classes out of existence ! Of all false and idle theories which have ever taken possession of a nation's mind, this ideal of unrestricted competition is, perhaps, the worst. It is Moloch-worship and Mammon-worship revived in their worst form, in the name of Liberty and Equality. It involves the sacrifice of the primary interest of every country which adopts it, production, for the momentary benefit, but the lasting loss and ultimate ruin of the consumer ! One would suppose the most patent of all economic truths to be, that men must produce before they can consume, and sell before they can buy. It is the law of God and nature, the most beneficent of laws, that every real good should be purchased by exertion, that man should eat bread in the sweat of his brow. This is the fundamental axiom of true political economy.

The question of exchange or trade is secondary, important as it is, and freedom of exchange must never be allowed to interfere with the essential interests of production. Two things are broadly needful to human life, food and clothing. No country can afford to be mainly fed or clothed by foreign countries. Every country is bound in the main to feed and clothe itself, as far as the necessaries of life are concerned. Of all necessaries corn is the chiefest, as Adam Smith said : the agricultural interest is primary : it involves the most healthful and needful of all forms of occupation. Adam Smith, who lived at a time when fiscal regulations and difficulties of transport threw great difficulties in the way of exchange, while he sought to promote this, laid down expressly that every country, and Britain in particular, was bound to protect its agricultural interests, so as not to be dependent on the foreigner for bread. When he wrote, the cost of transport was equivalent to a

high protective duty in itself. It need not be said that it is now cheaper to bring corn across the ocean than from one part of England to another; so that natural protection has ceased to exist. Now, I expect universal noodledom to cry at once, "But we must have foreign corn, because our population has increased so largely, and you want to shut it out." I want to do nothing of the kind, but I do want to grow as much as we can at home in Britain, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and to this end to secure a paying price for corn, so that it shall be profitable and not unprofitable to till our land. This *may*, doubtless, involve a small increase in the price of bread, and here universal noodledom will cry again, "What! would you tax the poor man's loaf?" It seems inordinately difficult to teach Englishmen that two and two make four, but can they not understand that to open our markets to the foreign labour of the world is necessarily to swamp home labour? Put as few duties as possible, or none, on goods which we cannot produce at home,—that is the broad rule of reason and of true freedom of commerce,—but take care, above and beyond all things, to guard the interests of native labour and of native capital also!

Doubtless, Protection has been carried too far in the past, when the cost of transport was large. Now famine prices have become impossible, unless there should be a universal failure of the world's crops, which is, to say the least, improbable. But we in Britain might have famine prices to-morrow in the case of a great war, because, drawing considerably more than half, nearer two-thirds, of our corn supply from abroad, and cruisers and privateers rendering the arrival of such supplies highly problematical, the price of corn would go up with a rush, and we should not have enough bread, at any price, wherewith to feed the people.

This is the consequence of our blind idolatry of the goddess cheapness, and of our absolute indifference to the primary interest of every land, production. A wholly fallacious political economy, derided by all other civilised nations, Americans, etc., has led the commonwealth astray. First, theorisers theorised wrongly on the absurd hypothesis, that consumption, not production, was the first thing to be considered by the State. Then Bright, Cobden, and the Anti-Corn Law League took up the foolish cry. Then a weak Prime Minister, who never in his life seized or expressed an idea, Sir Robert Peel, was converted to the worship of cheapness, and carried public opinion with him. Thus Free Trade was consummated, and for a good many years its folly was not found out. The immense development of the power of steam, the discovery of Australian gold, the erection of railways, found employment for labour and capital. In manufactures we had a long start of other countries in machinery and coal, and for a time we sold to them, nor did agricultural prices sink to their present ruinous rate, until the means of transport were gradually increased, and more and more foreign land was brought under tillage. Finally, as all men know agricultural and manufacturing prices have been lowered by unrestricted competition, until there remains no margin for profit. Now the multitudes are starving, and our anonymous advisers in *The Times*, *Standard*, and all other newspapers, who learnt their lesson some 30 or 40 years ago, go on assuring us that a mysterious wave of poverty is passing over the whole earth, which is an utter and a bare-faced LIE; that excess of production or the currency is to be blamed. Any excuse, however transparent, rather than bring themselves to confess that we are the victims of economic error, and have made the giant mistake of sacrificing labour and capital, and all our permanent interests to the greed and selfishness of a few importers.

When I think of all this, I regret that I am a priest, for were I in either House of Parliament, I will venture to say that I would soon rouse the country and the labouring masses to a sense of our economic madness, and the absolute and pressing need for wise PROTECTION.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
March 1, 1886.

## THE IRISH AND BRITISH QUESTION.

SIR,—Two of your correspondents, in your number of to-day, take exception to my statement that the consequence of Home Rule in Ireland will be civil war; neither of them alluding to me more than inferentially. One of them says that it is fudge; the other, that it is wicked. As "fudge" is the term employed by Mr. Burchell to express his opinion of the conversation of the lady who described the duke's eagerness in calling his valet, Jernigan, when he wanted his garters, I really don't see how it is applicable to a grave statement of fact respecting the temper of the people in a portion of the Queen's dominions. If, when we see in the newspapers that Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Morley, and Lord Spencer have been engaged in conference on the affairs of Ireland, which they know less about than the duke in Goldsmith knew about the fit of his stockings, one called "Fudge!" there might be some reason; none in the present case. As for its being wicked to give a warning of coming evils, no doubt Cassandra was thought a very bad person. But I do not wish to go to mythical times for examples. I do not ask the question, Was it wicked of Dr. Franklin to tell the English Government and people that perseverance in their tyranny over the colonists would lead to resistance? But I say that if he, who knew what America was, had not given warning, he would have failed in his duty.

The Rev. Mr. Gurney, with a "contrariness" (he is fond of Irish things, and I therefore characterise his views with an Irish word), accuses those who, knowing something about the subject, oppose Home Rule for this country in every form, of giving "fierce assurances that peace and order never, never shall be accepted." Why, what does he mean? He ought to know by this time that we of Ulster resist Home Rule because it will produce, not peace and order, but war and disorder. Your esteemed correspondent's plan for two "Chambers," or whatever he may call them, is, I feel confident, very unlike what will be proposed, if anything be really proposed, of the nature of Home Rule, by the present or any other Ministers of the Queen. But the thing is good in no shape.

Your other correspondent, who appears to be an inhabitant of this country, little as he knows about it, says that Ulster cannot single-handed fight the other provinces of Ireland, should those other provinces be supported by the strength of the British Empire. The people of Ulster know that quite well, and they have no such intention, and never thought of such a thing; but if there be a Dublin Parliament created,

they will not recognise its authority, and will not obey its laws. Your correspondent seems to think that the strength of the Queen's forces would be used to support the authority of a Dublin assembly. Now, if the Parliament of the United Kingdom should come to be so badly advised as to erect a Dublin Parliament into being, the object of that creation must be to leave Ireland to itself; and the very thing that your correspondent thinks would not happen will happen. He says that Orangemen are as intolerant as Romanists; he evidently knows little of either. Orangemen are certainly very intolerant of disloyalty, murder from behind hedges, cutting the hamstrings of cattle, and other favourite pastimes of the present dominant faction in the centre and south of Ireland; much more intolerant than the leading clergy of the schismatic Roman Church in this country. And they have a general contempt, which may savour of intolerance, for that description of Christianity under which the wickednesses that I speak of are committed unreproved, and often encouraged. If your correspondent thinks this intolerance objectionable, I am unable to unite with him.

There can be no greater mistake, as things now are, than for the English public to think that giving the Separatist party in Ireland their way would produce peace. If we refer to the history of the resistance of the Colonies in the last century to lawless tyranny, we find that the public of England was supplied with assurances that there would be no resistance. But there was resistance; passive at first, and then active. And so it will be in this country, if its civilised population should come, through the wilfulness and ignorance of statesmen, to be abandoned to a tyranny compared with which that of Lord North and Governor Hutchinson is as Rehoboam's little finger to Solomon's loins. SUBSCRIBER.

Armagh, February 27th, 1886.

---

SIR,—"A Puzzled Man" alluded to Mr. Archer Gurney's scheme for pacifying Ireland, asking him if he desired separate parliaments for the Channel Islands? Mr. Gurney tells us they have their parliaments. What he must show us is the identity of the Irish demands and his demands with the existing state of government in the Channel Islands. The Irish demands and Mr. Gurney's demands seem very much like separation amounting to divorce. In the Channel Islands it is *imperium in imperio;* the husband is still the head of the wife.

A PUZZLED MAN.

---

## REFORMS IN THE CHURCH.

SIR,—One of the reforms which the Church might help on, to the great advantage of the community at large, is that connected with our mode of disposing of the dead. Not many years since many abuses were regarded with apparent unconcern — delayed interment, extravagant mourning paraphernalia, crushing expenditure, evasive burial in imperishable coffins in brick graves, and burial places choked up with human remains in every stage and condition of decay. Let the Church now put into practice what is plainly indicated by the use of the words "body," "corpse," "earth to earth," in her "Order for the Burial of the Dead." Let her encourage the practice of burying in perishable coffins, each in its own grave, in earth sufficient for the proper and complete resolution of the body into its constituent elements. Let her also set an example of economy, simplicity, and good taste, she will have conferred upon the nation that which will be a credit to Christianity and a boon to the poor.—I am, your obedient servant,

F. LAWRENCE, Hon. Sec.

Church of England Funeral Reform Assoc.,
Westow, York, March 2nd, 1886.

---

## RITUALISM CLERICAL AND LAY.

SIR,—Your friend the Bishop of Lincoln and his "ridiculous mitre" are to the fore again. The following notice has appeared in *The World*:—

The wedding of Miss Sutton, of Scawby, to the Rev. George B. Simeon, took place on Wednesday last, at the pretty church of Scawby, in North Lincolnshire. The Bishop of Lincoln officiated, fully vested in purple cassock, rochet, white stole, cope and mitre.

The same paper describes the following piece of Ritualism in the House of Lords:—

Lord Herschell advanced to the throne, the railings of which had been removed and the throne itself left uncovered. Kneeling on a footstool, his lordship placed on the chair the patent of nobility, the possession of which he immediately resumed, and with an obeisance to the throne he handed, the document to the Garter King-at-Arms.

Why, in the name of reason, asks *The World*, should Lord Herschell go down on his knees to an empty chair? The explanation is that when the throne in the House of Lords is uncovered the Sovereign is supposed to occupy it, but granted all this, says *The World*, the sooner such mountebank antics are ended the better.

Sir I commend to *your* notice such excessive lay ritualism as this, and ask you to demolish it before you smash up Bishop King's "ridiculous mitre." It seems to me that a passing obeisance to the altar in a church is a small thing compared with actually kneeling before an empty chair in the House of Lords. CONSISTENCY.

P.S.—As a beneficed clergyman I have felt it a painful matter to kneel down to a Bishop in his study in order to go through the ceremony of institution.

[Our correspondent fails to observe a plain distinction that exists between the two cases of "mountebank antics," which he quotes from *The World*. Those of Lord Herschell are a survival of a former state of things, which has almost passed away. The present Lord Chancellor did not introduce them, very probably is tied by precedents which prevent him from discontinuing them, however ridiculous he may feel them to be. Those of the Bishop of Lincoln, on the other hand, have been deliberately reintroduced, after a discontinuance of several hundred years, by that prelate himself, with a view to the exaltation in the public eye of his office and himself. Both are equally shams; but the ecclesiastical one is much the more guilty, because it is deliberately self-chosen, and because it has been intruded, by one who ought to have abjured all sham and make-believe, into the very shrine of the God of simplicity, sincerity and truth.

Surely our correspondent does not think that we should "demolish Lord Herschell's lay ritualism before we smash up Bishop King's ridiculous mitre." Ours is an ecclesiastical newspaper, and its vocation is to exercise a censorship over ecclesiastical subjects and functionaries. It is the *Law Times* or

the *Law Journal* (or whatever the organ of the legal profession may be called) that should deal with Lord Herschell. Let every one sweep first before his own door. The bishops with their mitres, on the other hand, quite fall in our department; and, if they launch out into absurd vagaries of attire, we mean to laugh at them, quite as freely as we would at the "last sweet thing" in female dress.

Car comme les pêches et les melons
Sont pour la bouche d'un baron,
Ainsi les verges et les bâtons
Sont pour les fous, dit Solomon.

—ED.]

---

SIR,—I have seen it lately announced in several papers that Lord Alwyne Compton, Bishop of Ely, has ordered a "Mitre" from the ecclesiastical outfitter! You will have to devote a few more leaders to the subject of Playthings for Prelates, in order that you may be able to say "Liberavi animam meam." That will be about the net result of your protest. Copes and mitres will soon be the order of the day. LOOKER ON.

P.S. The bishops are taking the lead in this matter; but we may hope ere long to see Archiepiscopal Mitres; something distinctive ought to be designed for the Patriarch of Canterbury, "the Pope of the other world."

## THE BLACK RUBRIC AGAIN!

SIR,—I am afraid that your readers will be weary of this endless carping and nibbling at our Black Rubric, but as often as a contemporary goes on trying to prove its harmony with Trent, it is an honest man's duty to protest. Romish doctrine may be right—so some think—but it and the Black Rubric cannot possibly agree. This is felt by readers of your contemporary; and so it is pestered with queries, which it has to answer, some way or other. In the present number we have a reply to one styling himself "Elbaston." What he asks we know not, but here comes the answer :—

2. "The answer is very simple. The Black Rubric, however clumsily it may be phrased"—clumsily, indeed! Shades of Sheldon, Cosin, and the other worthies of the Savoy Conference! But let us hear him on. "The Black Rubric, however, &c., merely denies two views, which the Romish Church also denies,"—perfect harmony!—first, "that the presence is a local one, after the ordinary laws of bodies having extension." Mercy on us! where has the Black Rubric a word of this? A local presence "of any kind" is what the Black Rubric denies and declares impossible, for this plain reason, that Christ's natural body and blood are in heaven, and cannot, without ceasing to be a natural body, be at one time in more places than one. How, then, can the Editor have the face to tell us that the Black Rubric does not deny every kind of a local presence as impossible, but only "a local one after the ordinary laws of bodies?" St. Augustine says that if our Lord's body is not subject to the same laws as other bodies it is no real body at all. And then, what becomes of the Resurrection?

3. But now we come to the second thing which the Black Rubric denies—"The Lutheran theory that our Lord's body is ubiquitous." I do not know that this theory is held by all Lutherans, though, according to Burnet, it was by some. At any rate, I have seen it maintained by ritualists, that His Body is ubiquitous because His Divinity is so. However, we may leave that theory aside. There is another, that on consecration His Body is present on all altars at the same moment. This is the ubiquity which the Black Rubric condemns.

4. But let us hear the answer out. "The Revisers of 1661, who put that Rubric into the Prayer Book in its present form, were, almost to a man, believers in the Real Presence,"—Aye, but *what kind* of a Real Presence? That is the point. A virtual one or a local one? I am sure that they all held a virtual presence—not *almost*, but *really*—to a man. But to proceed—"and were men of ability and learning besides, who were not likely to insert a clause condemning their own belief." I should think not, indeed, being such men as Patrick and his companions. It is gracious of the Editor, after calling them clumsy, to allow them ability and learning. To think of the Editor sitting in judgment on the Savoy divines, and telling us that, being what they were, they were not likely to condemn their own belief. Think of Dr. Busby's pupils having the face to say that he was not a blockhead! I fancy they would be made to feel the truth of this in all parts of their bodies. But we have not done with the Editor yet. "There is," he says, "a very easy way of testing the truth of this in our statement as to the Black Rubric agreeing with authoritative Roman teaching." As if we need any proof that Rome does not teach that our Lord's Body cannot be in two places at once! But let us hear the test. "Write out the Rubric afresh, altering it so as to exactly contradict its present meaning, and invite any Roman theologian to say whether he accepts that form as true doctrine, and produce warrant for so doing." Well, I comply. I write the opposite of the Black Rubric:—"The Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven locally, and here locally, at the same moment. It is not against the truth of Christ's Natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." And now let the Roman Theologian say whether, or not, he accepts that form as true doctrine, and can produce warrant for so doing. I have directly contradicted the Black Rubric. Whether Rome holds with my contradiction, Rome, or her backer-up, must now say.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

---

FUNERAL REFORM.—The Council of the Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, of which the Dean of York is chairman, have issued the following report of the past year's work :—During the past year much has been done to make known the Society's aims, which were to christianise, simplify, and cheapen funeral and mourning ceremonial. Sermons had been preached in Canterbury Cathedral, in Edinburgh Cathedral, and at Leeds, Darlington, Malton, Portsmouth, Winchester, York and elsewhere, by the Honorary Secretary. Addresses had been given by him to working men at Grantham, Doncaster, Malton, Leeds, and other places. A paper had been read by him on "Danger to public health by burial in imperishable coffins" before the Sanitary Congress at Leicester. Conferences had been held at Darlington, Edinburgh, Newcastle. Malton, Willis's Rooms, London, Leeds, Portsmouth, Winchester, Aberdeen, Whitby, Dewsbury Beverley,

Hull and York. A joint Conference of the two Houses of the Northern Convocation had been held in the Chapter House of York Minster. The Society's publications had been sent to fifty local honorary secretaries for gratuitous circulation. Several thousands of pamphlets, reports and leaflets had been distributed gratis in many parts of the Kingdom, and some sent to the Colonies. Many communications had been sent by telegraph and by post to the chief daily newspapers in England and Scotland, as also to all the English Church papers.

THE enthronement of the Bishop of Ely has been fixed for Tuesday next, at eleven, and will be followed by Holy Communion. A reception at the palace will close the proceedings. The clergy of the diocese attending have been requested to bring surplices. They will, with the Dean, Chapter, and Archdeacons, meet the Bishop at the west door.

AT a Convocation of the University of Durham on Friday week assent was given to the following important alteration in the regulations of the University: —The Warden and Senate shall have authority to arrange a special examination for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, to which persons shall be admitted who, being less than twenty-seven years of age and in priests' orders, have kept three terms at least by residence in the University, and are of the standing of twelve terms at least from the date of passing the final examination either for the degree of Bachelor of Arts or for the licence in theology. Such persons shall be required to be well acquainted with the New Testament in Greek, and with such portions of the Old Testament and in such languages as the Warden and Senate shall from time to time determine, as well as with such other branch or branches of theological study as shall be prescribed by the Warden and Senate from time to time. Clergy not members of the University, in priests' orders, and of not less than fifteen years' standing from deacons' orders, who have produced satisfactory testimonials of moral character, shall be admitted to this examination. No person who has been admitted to this degree shall be admitted to the degree of Doctor of Divinity unless he has previously been admitted to the degree of Master of Arts in this University.

JUST a year has elapsed since the scheme of a Trinity College, Cambridge, Mission was first mooted, and a meeting was held on the 4th inst. to report progress. The Rev. Norman Campbell had undertaken the duties of Missioner, and was entering on the charge of a new district in St. George's, Camberwell, when a vacancy occurred by the promotion of an incumbent who had held the arduous post for more than fifty years, and the Bishop appointed Mr. Campbell to the charge of the parish itself. This necessitated a reconsideration of the scheme of the Mission, and it has finally been decided to take a course which has not been attempted in similar cases hitherto. Mr. Campbell is to retain his position as head of the Mission, as well as vicar of the parish, and the assistance in the way of men, buildings, and money which the college can render is to be applied in any part of the large parish where it is most needed, and not necessarily limited to a special district. The money at the disposal of the committee will enable them to build a Mission hall, to obtain a Mission house where the staff of the parish will be able to reside, and where accommodation will be available for occasional helpers, and to provide the chief part of the salaries of a couple of Mission curates. The funds of the college Mission will be thus expended on specific departments of evangelistic and other work in the more needy parts of the large parish of 20,000 people, and not confined to one particular district. The change of front brought about by the unusual opportunity given to this college Mission has caused some little delay; but with assistance from the college and the Additional Curates' Society Mr. Campbell hopes to find himself at the head of a sufficient staff soon after Easter. He will be somewhat short-handed till then, but two members of the college intend to reside in the district and give him amateur help through the vacation, which means the last four weeks of Lent, and others will render some occasional assistance. The meeting on Thursday was very enthusiastic: Mr. Stanton was in the chair; Canon Mason, the Rev. H. Montgomery, of Kennington, Mr. Campbell and Mr. Holland, both members of the Mission staff, and Professor Westcott were the principal speakers.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. Thomas Kingdon, Rector of Freshford, near Bath; Vicar of St. Peter's, Clifton, Bristol.

Burrowes, Rev. Henry; Vicar of St. Mary's, Waterloo, Liverpool.

Brice, Rev. Edward, B.A.; Vicar of St. Jude's, Manningham, Bradford.

Bridgewater, Rev. Cuthbert, Curate of Codford St. Peter, Bath; Rector of St. Tudy, Cornwall.

Flynn, Rev. Francis, Chaplain to the *Turquoise*.

Greenhow, Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of Earsdon, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Surrogate.

Hedley, Rev. Thomas, Rector of Grundisburgh, Suffolk; Rural Dean of Carlford.

Herring, Rev. R. F., Curate of Morpeth; Vicar of St. John's, Toxteth Park, Liverpool.

Hodgson, Rev. W. G. C., Curate of Penrith; Rector of Distington.

Hunter, Rev. Henry C. F., Chaplain to the *Ajax*.

Lee, Rev. Arthur George, M.A., Vicar of Chippenham, Cambridgeshire; Rector of Langham, Suffolk.

Lewis, Rev. J. W., Vicar of Norbiton, near Kingston-on-Thames; Rector of Freshford, near Bath.

Mackey, Rev. Donald John, M.A., Curate of St. John-the-Baptist's, Glastonbury; Vicar of Cleeton St. Mary, Salop.

Mather, Rev. Herbert, Vicar of Loddington, Leicester; Rural Dean of Gartre III. Portion.

Parnell, Rev. T. A., Reader to the Waddington Hospital, Clitheroe.

Rooker, Rev. John, Vicar of St. Peter's, Clifton, Bristol; Vicar of Norbiton, near Kingston-on-Thames.

Tomlinson, Rev. William Bannister, B.A.; Vicar of Little Ouseburn.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brett, Rev. William Henry, B.D. forty years Missionary S.P.G., Chaplain to the Bishop of Guiana, and late Rector of Holy Trinity, Essequibo, British Guiana, at Bowruma, Paignton, Devon, on the 10th ult., aged 67.

Clutton, Rev. Ralph, B.D., Rector of Wickham Bishops, late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, on the 4th inst, aged 81.

Home, Rev. John Hume, LL.B., for twelve years Curate-in-Charge, and twenty-two Rector of Bradley, Worcestershire, at Bournemouth, aged 66.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## UNION TO CHRIST.

By the Rev. GEORGE SALMON, D.D., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, Dublin.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford.

"Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in Me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without Me ye can do nothing."—John xv. 4, 5.

THE course of modern controversies has forced us to take notice of the diversity of the authors whose agency has been employed in the composition of the Holy Scriptures. It was easy for interpreters of former days, in the fulness of their conviction that all was God's Book, to lose sight of the human element in Scripture. Thus they might establish their doctrines by arbitrarily combining sayings of writers who lived hundreds of years apart, and were, to all appearance, speaking of different subjects: they might be blind to all differences between the various writers except when their attention was roused by some striking apparent discrepancy which demanded explanation. Our tendencies to error lie in the opposite direction. In our days some of the most laborious students of the Bible have been men who absolutely refuse to recognise any Divine element in it. They have busied themselves in noting the characteristics of the various writers, their peculiarities in form of expression or turn of thought. It has been no shock to them to discover or think they discovered discordances in statement of fact or in modes of presenting religious truth. Nay, so super-subtle have they been in finding such differences, that they have persuaded themselves they saw them in what a more sober criticism has no hesitation in recognising as works of the same author, and have been led to cut homogeneous books into fragments, supposed to be inconsistent in their character. But when all exaggeration and fanciful speculation has been stripped away, there remain, as results of modern criticism, a number of facts which no honest student of God's Word can refuse to include in his system; nor is any theory of inspiration now likely to be advocated which does not fully recognise the character imprinted on the Bible by the diversity of agents through whom the Holy Spirit worked.

And when we consider the matter we see that, whatever we might beforehand have thought likely, this arrangement, in which our sacred volume is not a book, but a library, not a single document written in a uniform style, but coloured with the personality of several individual writers, is intimately connected with the fact that ours is a historical religion. It rests on our belief of certain great facts attested by chosen witnesses who live for us in their writings. We know each by his style, his favourite expressions, his turn of thought. There are few living persons of whose character we have as vivid a conception as that of of St. Paul. His character impresses itself on believers and unbelievers alike. All admit that he was incapable of deceit, and so whatever theory of our Lord's resurrection is framed must reconcile itself with the fact that one who was on the most familiar terms with the first asserters of the miracle, both most fully believed their story, and claimed to have had himself personal confirmation of its truth. Again, the fact that the witnesses are not one, but many, gives a cumulative force to their testimony. It is well known to you what use Paley made of the argument from coincidences, in establishing the historical credibility of our documents. But also in ascertaining the doctrines of the Christian revelation, attention may rightly be called to the force added to the proof when we have the agreement of different witnesses. Divines of a former generation might have been content to point out that such and such a doctrine was proved by so many Scripture texts. It is no disadvantage to us that the course of modern controversies forces us to take notice that these texts are in many cases taken from different writings. We are thus enabled to see how the Church from the first performed her office of witnessing to the truth when we can call up members of the apostolic Church and find them in complete agreement, not only with regard to such external facts as our Lord's death and resurrection, but also with respect to what may be called revealed facts, such as our Lord's pre-existence, His share in the work of creation, the rule which He now exercises sitting at the right hand of God, His future return to judgment. It is my purpose on this occasion to exemplify this accordance of teaching with regard to the doctrine contained in the text, the Union of Christ with His Church; to show that this idea, which is certainly not an obvious one, or one likely to have occurred independently to different disciples (for I do not know that the followers of any philosopher, or of any other religious teacher, imagined any such relation to exist between them and their master), was common to the different New Testament writers, and was made the basis of their system of doctrines. I will first speak of the surface agreement, I mean the direct statement of the doctrine in various passages, and then of the deeper, underlying agree-

ment disclosed in doctrines which all the Christian teachers included in their system, and which have their root and their justification in this principle of the intimate union between Christ's people and their Head. The Synoptic Gospels professedly deal with the history of our Lord in His life of humiliation, and therefore cannot be expected to give much evidence as to the relations between the risen Saviour and the Church, which at the time of which these Gospels treat, can hardly be said to have been in existence. But we may take notice of the closing promise which St. Matthew records as made by our Lord ere He parted with His disciples, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." In these words we have the difference on which I just remarked between the conception which the Christians entertained of the relation between them and their Founder, and that which prevailed in other philosophic or religious sects. Others were zealous to venerate the memory of the great man to whose instruction they had been indebted for their knowledge, or by whose laws they were glad to be governed, but his activity was in their idea a thing of the past. Christians thought of their Master as ever with them, and trusted for safety in all their trials to the abiding presence of Him who possessed all power in heaven and earth.

In an earlier chapter of St. Matthew we have put in a striking way the doctrine of Christ's identification of Himself with His people. You remember the description of Christ's coming in His glory, and all the holy angels with him; and how He rewards those placed on His right hand because when He had been an hungred they had given Him meat, thirsty they had given Him drink, a stranger and they had taken Him in, naked, and they had clothed Him, sick and in prison, and they had visited him. And when they disclaim having rendered Him any such service He tells them, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me." This saying of our Lord is not recorded by St. Luke, yet in his second work the third Evangelist has given different expression to the same idea. When Saul, of Tarsus, made havoc of the Church and wasted it, Jesus is introduced as acknowledging His Church's trials as His own, and as stopping the career of the persecutor with the words, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?"

But one thing more in the Synoptic Gospels must not be passed over, that story which all three are careful to tell, how our Lord, the same night that He was betrayed, commanded His disciples thenceforward to show forth His death by eating His body and drinking His blood. It would lead us away from our subject if I were to enter into any minute discussion what sense is to be given to these words; but this lies on the surface of them, that our Lord instructed His disciples that they were in some way to enter into communion of the most intimate kind with His own personality. And this is confirmed by the fourth Evangelist. He does not repeat what his predecessors had told of the institution of that sacred feast, but he records another discourse in which Jesus describes Himself as the living bread which came down from heaven, speaks of His flesh and His blood, given for the life of the world, as the true meat and drink, makes the participation of them the essential condition of obtaining eternal life, and states as the result of this participation that he that eateth that flesh and drinketh that blood dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him. One whose attention has not been called to it would scarcely conceive how completely St. John's mind was pervaded by the idea of this mutual indwelling of Christ and His people. It runs through his first epistle from one end to the other. And as St. John also held the doctrine of a complete union between the Son and the Father, he interchanges with the assertion of an indwelling of Christ, a similar assertion of an indwelling of the Father. And among the many proofs of common authorship of St. John's Gospel and his Epistles, the identity of language on the subject we are considering deserves to hold a high place. In our Lord's prayer for His disciples, recorded in John xvii., He asks for them that they all may "be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us: that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one." The Epistle opens with the assertion, "Our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." It closes with, "We are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. To be "in Him" was the privilege to which every professing member of the Church aspired, and of the validity of their claim to which they were bound to assure themselves, "Hereby know we that we are in Him." "He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself so to walk even as He walked." "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not; whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him, neither known Him." "He that keepeth His commandment dwelleth in Him, and He in him." "Hereby we know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us." "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." Thus all through St. John's Epistle we have constant echoes of the doctrine formally expressed in the discourse from which the text is taken, that union between Christ and His people is as intimate as that between the vine and His branches; this union being the same source of all the branches' fertility, as, on the other hand, their failing to produce fruit is the mark of separation from Him. Of the New Testament writers there are no two more unlike and independent of each other than St. John and St. Paul, and therefore their complete agreement in a doctrine is strong proof that that doctrine must have been

part of the common possession of the Church. Now in this doctrine of the necessity of Christ dwelling in them, St. Paul's language is an echo of St. John's. "Know ye not," he says to the Corinthians, "how that Jesus Christ is in you except ye be reprobates?" To the Romans he says, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His. And if Christ be in you the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." One of St. Paul's favourite images, occurring in several distinct letters, is the comparison of Christians to a temple built for the dwelling of the Holy Ghost, of which the several Christians are living stones, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, language, I may add, with regard to which there is strong coincidence between the Epistle to the Ephesians and St. Peter's First Epistle; but St. Paul uses another comparison still more closely akin to St. John's figure of the vine. Christians are a body of which Christ is the Head. Each member has its several functions, but from Him the nourishment is derived by which the whole body makes its increase. "No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it even as the Lord the Church; for we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." It is unnecessary for me to multiply proofs how completely the belief pervaded the Christian Church, that in some mystical but very real manner a union existed between them and their ascended Lord, which was the source of the spiritual life of every member. I go on then to speak of the less direct evidence that the belief of which I am speaking was an essential part of Christian teaching afforded by the other doctrines, which have their explanation and justification in this central truth. And first with regard to the doctrine of the Atonement. We have heard many discussions in our day as to the ethics of vicarious suffering, on the questions whether it is just and right that one person should suffer for another and whether such suffering can make satisfaction for that other's sins, questions scarcely touched on by the sacred writers. And, perhaps, the reason is that they did not look so exclusively, as some modern writers do, on that aspect of that atonement in which it may be illustrated by the payment of a debt, a transaction in which it is of course immaterial whether the satisfaction be made by the person who owes it, or by another for him. But an essential part of the New Testament doctrine of the Atonement is that the satisfaction is performed by no stranger, but by One bound by the closest ties to those for whom it is made, by the Head of the family who are to be thereby reconciled. And in this point of view the Atonement is illustrated by a class of analogies quite different from those which are used when it is regarded as the payment of a ransom or debt. To suffer for others, to make atonement for others, is one of the most constantly recurring experiences of life. Human life owes almost all its security and the greater part of its happiness to the fact that, whether by nature or by choice, by the ties of common family, common country, voluntary association, different individuals are bound together into one body. And the law of such bodies is not only that if one member be honoured the others rejoice with it, but that if one member suffer the others must suffer with it. For as in the natural body the nerves, along which in health thrill so many sensations of pleasure, at times rack the frame with cruel achings, so those ties of union which in various ways bind us in one body with our fellow-men do at times bring us pain instead of happiness, pain which we are content to accept on account of the vastly greater happiness which has come through the same channels. We owe so much, for instance, to our country and its laws, which give us security for property, and life, and family comfort, that it is justly accounted the grossest ingratitude if we do not love our fatherland, or if we hesitate to give our substance or our life for it should its needs require. Yet this tie of union with the other men who inhabit with us the same land may bring on us calamities which no sins of our own had deserved. The misconduct of those who have been chosen to govern, their unjust ambition, their rashness, their want of foresight leading to measures which we have condemned and against which we have protested, may involve the country in sufferings of which we must take our share; we must, by our exertions and our sacrifices, contribute to the atonement necessary to undo the evil which has been done. Nor will those without, to whom compensation may be due, distinguish between the innocent and the guilty, bound together in a common solidarity. Not to draw any illustration from current events, how many Frenchmen were there in 1870 who had entirely disapproved the policy which had plunged their country into war, yet had to make bitter atonement for their ruler's mistakes, and that not wrested from them reluctantly, but given of their own choice, because they deemed that no matter by whose fault their country had been brought into distress, it had a right to claim from them in its hour of trial, their substance, their lives, and their children. Family life, source though it be of our purest enjoyments, will at times bring its pains. The heart of the parent may be wrung by the misconduct of a child, and he may think it the least of his sufferings that he has to make atonement to others for the injury which the prodigal has caused them. On the other hand, often has the Jewish proverb been verified, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's

teeth are set on edge." Often has the son had to pay in health or fortune the penalty of his father's recklessness; and it has not rarely happened that the son has undertaken the voluntary burden of making satisfaction for his parent's wrongs, by the discharge of his neglected obligations. The innocent wife of a guilty husband must share the penalty of his wrong-doing, having as little the power as the will to separate her lot from his. In theory these may be instances of vicarious suffering, but they are not felt so. Could you dissuade a woman from following her husband into exile on the ground that it was not just that she should suffer for another? Would she not reply that he for whom she was suffering was not another, but in such sense one with herself, that their joys and sorrows must of necessity be common? Thus we see that we give an imperfect representation of the doctrine of the Atonement if we discuss the possibility or the justice of the penalty of our sins being borne by another. For an essential part of the doctrine is that He who bore our sins and carried our sorrows was no stranger, but One in the closest union with those whom He saved; the Head of their family; related to them in the same way as Adam to the human race, or, as the relation is elsewhere figured, bound to them in mystical union closer than that of human marriage. When this is borne in mind it seems less to call for explanation that the sorrows of those whom He loves should be His, that His victory over sin and death should be theirs. Thus it would appear that the doctrine of the Atonement is involved in the very fact of the Incarnation. When once it is revealed that Christ took upon Him the nature of men, is not ashamed to call them brethren, made Himself partake, like them, of flesh and blood, it seems to follow that He must bear the griefs and carry the sorrows of those with whom He entered into so intimate a partnership, and surely also that those sufferings borne by Him who was Himself sinless should avail to make reconciliation for the sins of the people whom He had made His own. Whether there be a logical necessity or not, there is, at all events, complete harmony between the doctrine that Christ took on Him man's nature—that He filled the place of the second Adam, that is to say, Head of the redeemed family—and the doctrine that He made satisfaction for those with whom He entered into so close a relation, and that He has made them to share in His privileges and benefit by His triumphs. It is on the last point that I have next to speak, the privileges of Christ's people, my object being to show that the New Testament language on the subject is all pervaded by the same conception of the union between them and their Head.

And in the first place I would direct your attention to the promises made to prayer in the name of Christ. Twice St. John introduces our Lord solemnly promising, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you." Elsewhere it runs, "If ye shall ask anything in My name I will do it." Consequently that prayer should be offered in the name of Christ has become an elementary and fundamental principle of Christian worship. This rule of worship has existed as far back as we can trace the history of the Christian Church. Within the last couple of years the earliest extant document of the sub-Apostolic Church, the Epistle of Clement of Rome, has been completed by the recovery of the contents of the missing leaf of the only MS. until lately known to contain it. Great part of this is occupied with a prayer, which probably reproduces for us the liturgical use of the Church of Rome before the end of the first century. And how does this prayer end? "Through the High Priest and Guardian of our souls, Jesus Christ, through Whom be glory and majesty unto Thee, both now and for all generations, and for ever and ever." It has been disputed whether the Gospel of St. John was written before the end of the first century. This prayer of Clement's shows us one of two things, either that that Gospel was in A.D. 97 already known and honoured, and that the Church had derived from it the rule of offering its praises and confessions through Christ, or else that that rule expresses the practice of the Church from a time before that Gospel had been committed to writing; but if so, we cannot doubt that that Gospel truly explains the origin of the practice; namely, special promises of acceptance to prayer so offered made by our Lord Himself during His earthly sojourn. And this rule of prayer has, we all know, continued from the first century to the nineteenth. It is the more striking in our own form of prayer, because, like the other Western Churches, we use not one long continuous prayer, break up our prayer into a number of collects, each closing with the same formula. Our ears are so familiar with the sounds "through Jesus Christ our Lord," or "for Jesus Christ's sake," that, perpetually as they occur in the course of our service, they scarcely attract our notice, or induce us to ask ourselves what we mean when we utter them. Yet surely if we once allow our minds to dwell on the words, we see that they are alive with doctrine. In the first place, what a conception does the use of this form imply of the dignity of Christ: that when addressing our Father and our Maker, who, we may believe, loves the creatures whom His hand has formed, and whose willingness to hear their petitions was recognised by Old Testament saints, we still put forward no other claim for acceptance of our request than that we are privileged to address our prayers through Christ, for whose worthiness we hope to be

granted that which in our own name we had not dared to ask! And in the second place what a conception it gives us of our union with Christ that we should feel ourselves warranted to make this use of His name! In our intercourse with each other, there is no privilege we are more chary of bestowing than the right to use our name. The circumstances must be very special when we would give to one about to ask a favour from a third party authority to say that the benefit bestowed on him might be regarded as an obligation conferred on ourselves. Yet surely nothing less than this is implied when we ask a petition for Jesus Christ's sake. We do really plead in prayer that saying of our Lord to which I have already referred, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me." In these words He taught us that He regarded the meanest of His people as so one with Him that He would own mercy shown to them for His sake as if He were Himself the destitute suppliant who demanded aid. It is wonderful love and condescension that He has thus knit together the members of His mystical body by their common relation to Him, and enabled each to claim the love and good offices of the others, as they love and value their Lord from whom flows the spiritual life of all. Yet far more wonderful it is that He gives us authority to use the same plea in our addresses to the Supreme, and reveals to us that the love which the eternal Father bears to His only begotten Son must embrace all who are one with Him. Nay, if we examine more closely the phrase, "prayer through Christ," we find reason to think that it has a deeper meaning still. Those words I quoted from Clement, "through our High Priest Christ," I think allow us to see what the ancient Church understood by them. As in the Old Dispensation the high-priest offered for the sins of the people and presented their incense before the mercy-seat of God, so Christ having once for all made satisfaction for the sins of men, remaining a High Priest for ever, presents the incense of His people's prayers and thanksgivings before the mercy-seat on high. Thus the privilege of making prayer through Christ is represented not by the analogy of one who is entitled to use the name of an absent third person, but by that of one who has that person as a present advocate and intercessor, who will make the request of the petitioner his own. I think that when we allow our minds to dwell on all that is meant by praying in the name of Christ, and praying through Christ, we cannot appreciate the greatness of the privilege without being forced to ask ourselves, Can I, without any feeling of unreality, come to God and claim blessings from Him, on the ground of my being so united to Christ, that I am entitled to plead His promise that He counts what is done to His people as done to Himself? And again, Are the objects of my desire, the things that I wish to pray for, such that I can without any sense of unfitness entrust my requests to Christ, and ask Him to make my petitions His.

We are sometimes tempted to think of prayer as a kind of magic charm, which will give us the power of getting the benefits we wish for, and turning away the calamities we are afraid of, and overlook that we are only entitled to claim the New Testament promises to prayer on the terms of being united to Christ by living faith, and in virtue of that union of being assimilated to His character. Christ's promise is, "If ye abide in Me, and My words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." Elsewhere the Apostle says, "This is the confidence that we have in Him, that if we ask anything according to His will He heareth us." It might seem as if the Apostle's words, "If we ask anything according to His will," put a limitation on the success of prayer not contained in our Lord's promise. Yet the difference between these two phrases, "whatsoever ye will," "whatsoever is according to His will," is found to disappear when it is stated that the suppliant must be in union with Christ, that is to say, in union with One the principle of Whose whole life was the doing His Father's will, Who made it the daily prayer of His disciples, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven," Whose own prayer in His last agony was, "Father, not My will, but Thine, be done."

In another verse of this 15th of John it is implied that the promises of answer to prayer, however absolute in form, are really conditioned, it being required that they who ask should be living and fruitful members of the true Vine. Verse 16: "I have chosen and ordained you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain, that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in My name, He may give it you." In these words it is clearly implied that this union with Christ exhibited by the fruits of holiness is a condition necessary in order to enable any to claim the promise that the Father will give what is asked in the name of His Son. And this brings me to speak of the Christian doctrine of sanctification, in which we find surprising unity between the doctrine of the New Testament teachers. It is quite intelligible that they who lived in the company of Jesus of Nazareth, and who had been witnesses of the spotless purity of His life, His meekness, His unselfishness, His implicit trust in His Father, His zeal for His glory, His love for men's souls and bodies, should feel strongly themselves, and should impress on their disciples the duty of imitating so perfect a model. I do not know, therefore, that much stress from an evidential point of view can be laid on the undoubted fact that all the New Testament writers agree in dwelling on

Christ as our Example, except that if the case were otherwise, we might have cause to suspect that His life had not been such as we now know it to have been. St. Matthew represents our Lord as saying, "Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly of heart." St. John in his Gospel, "I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." St. Paul, "Let this mind be in you which also was in Christ Jesus." St. Peter, "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow His steps, who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. Who when He was reviled reviled not again; when He suffered He threatened not, but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously." And St. John in his Epistle gives as the test of union with Christ, "He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also so to walk even as He walked." But the New Testament doctrine goes beyond this inculcation of likeness to Christ as a duty incumbent on all who claim to be united with Him. It asserts that union with Christ bestows a power to attain this likeness to Christ, and is a necessary condition to the attainment of such power. This doctrine, which is fully expressed in the parable from St. John which I have taken as my text, so pervades Paul's Epistles, that it is difficult to select quotations to establish it. He describes the believer as buried with Christ in baptism, and the old man thereby being crucified and slain as the rising again with Him to newness of life. "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me." So he writes to the Galatians. To the Colossians he says: "If ye then be risen with Christ seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections on things above, not on things of the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." This language might sound mystical if it stood alone, but light is thrown on it by the comparisons elsewhere used by the apostle, in particular where he compares Christ to the Head of the body, from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. In other words, the doctrine is that the spiritual life of every Christian depends on his being united with Christ, and in virtue of that union drawing from Him continued supplies of grace and strength, by which alone he can make growth and exhibit fruit.

Once more the same principle, which is made the root of the Christian's present holiness, is also made that of his future blessedness. It has often been remarked how vague the New Testament is in its description of the happiness of the future state. This much seems to have been regarded as sufficient for us to know, that if we have been united to Christ here, we cannot be separated from Him hereafter, and that whatever we shall be, we shall be like Him. "If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him." "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with Him in glory." "It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." The thought perpetually recurs that Christ shares with His people His own glory. In St. Luke our Lord is related to have said to His disciples, "I appoint unto you a kingdom as My Father hath appointed unto Me." We have the same thought in different words in the Book of the Revelation: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in my Throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with My father in His throne." And the whole idea is expanded in our Lord's prayer, recorded in John xvii., "The glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them, that they may be one, even as We are One, I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them as Thou hast loved Me. Father, I will that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am, that they may behold My glory which Thou hast given Me, for Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world." Thus you will see that the idea of future blessedness presented in all the New Testament books where it is spoken of is something based on union with Christ, participation through Christ's goodness of the glory which the Father had bestowed on Him, being with Christ where He is, being in every sense like Christ.

I think the examination we have made enables us to understand why it is that Socinianism proper is now an extinct heresy, a deserted half-way house which no one now stops at. There are many now who believe Jesus of Nazareth to have been mere man, a Jewish sage it may be, of exceptional wisdom and goodness, but still in no essential respect different in nature from other men. But those who so believe do not attempt to establish their creed by Scripture, nor have they any solicitude to reconcile themselves with the teaching of the early Church. If they think but humbly of our Lord, they have still less reverence for His immediate followers, and would not scruple to claim to be in a multitude of points wiser than they. So they have got long past the stage of those who equally taught the bare humanity of our Lord, but who conceived themselves bound to maintain that such a doctrine was primitive Christianity. As I have said, the passages of the New Testament which have come under our study the last two Sundays are enough to exhibit the hopelessness of reconciling Socinian views of our Lord's nature with the belief of His followers as recorded in the New Testament. I have not

brought before you to-day any of the texts whch are commonly quoted to prove our Lord's Divinity; and I have thrown in the background those which speak of the unity between our Lord and His people as but a feeble counterpart of the unity between our Lord and His Father which existed before the world was. But we have seen evidence that the first disciples looked on their Master as holding a position corresponding to that of Adam as federal Head of a new creation; and believed that all who find God's favour do so because so united to Christ that their sins brought suffering on Him, that His righteousness brought salvation to them; and believed that that righteousness, the righteousness of Christ, must be worked out in the lives of His people, that they are entitled in coming to God in prayer to plead Christ's merits as giving them a claim to His favour; and looked forward to no happiness hereafter but what they gain as joined to their risen and ascended Lord. These are not the views of any single authority, but the evidence is harmonious of every writer from whom we learn anything as to what primitive Christianity was; and the agreement extends to every detail of the doctrine.

It is simply impossible to suppose that they who believed thus of our Lord looked on Him as a man like others, and, therefore, we feel under no temptation to look for strained methods of interpretation when we read that they worshipped Him as their Lord and their God, that they owned Him as the Word of God by whom all things were made, which was in the beginning with God, and which was God.

It needs to say but few words in conclusion as to the practical bearing of the doctrines we have been considering. It is not merely in an evidential point of view that it is important to notice the perfect harmony of the Christian doctrines, some, which at first sight might be supposed to be independent and distinct, turning out on closer examination to be only different aspects of the same truth. But it is quite as important practically to bear in mind the essential unity of the different parts of the Christian scheme. There have been ungodly men who have turned the grace of our God to lasciviousness, who have caught eagerly at the doctrine that the penalty of our sins has been borne by another, and who have inferred that we ourselves being now secure from paying what has been discharged already, need trouble ourselves neither with sorrow for sin past, nor be solicitous about precautions against sin future. To all of us it is delightful to think that the eyes of the Lord are upon us, and His ears open to our prayers, joyful to believe that our inheritance shall be with Christ in glory. But we have seen that the privileges and the duties of the Christian life are inseparably connected. Antinomianism is a thing impossible if we once clearly understand that all our hopes, all our claims on God's favour rest on our being one with Christ, a union which implies sympathy with the mind of Christ, zeal for the things for which He was solicitous, hatred of what He hated, perfect likeness to His character. Brethren, may God grant to each of you that Christ may dwell in your heart by faith, that yon may be strengthened by His Spirit in tne inner man; gaining from Him power to overcome your spiritnal enemies; continually changed from glory to glory till you attain complete likeness to His image.

---

HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN, FOR APRIL, 1886.—SELECTED BY THE REV. JOHN NAPLETON.—4th, Fourth Sunday in Lent. Morning: 45, 258, 185. Evening: 109, 197, 189.—11th, Fifth Sunday in Lent. Morning: 195, 283, 188. Evening: 111, 254, 95.—18th, Palm Sunday. Morning: 98+, 264, 114, 269. Evening: 99+, 186, 118, 335.—25th, Easter Sunday. Morning: 134+, 132, 127, 128. Evening: 138+, 131, 133, 135.

THE next session of the Salisbury Diocesan Synod is fixed for Wednesday and Thursday, May 5th and 6th.

MR. DYKE ACLAND, M.P., has been gazetted Second Church Estates Commissioner, in the room of Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, resigned.

THE following have been elected representatives of the London Diocesan Conference at the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences:—Clerical—Sir E. Bayley, Canon Cadman, and Dr. Thornton. Lay—The Hon. T. H. W. Pelham, Mr. Spottiswoode, and Mr. E. Stock. Archdeacon Hessey declined to be put in nomination.

LAST Sunday, Mr. Lias, of Cambridge, completed an interesting course of lectures on "The Church and Modern Society." They have been delivered in his own church (St. Edward's) after evensong, and have attracted large congregations, in which both the town and the University were well represented. He has dealt with many pressing problems of the present day. The Church and the Sects, the Church and Unbelief, the Church of the Future, are difficult topics to handle, but Mr. Lias has succeeded in dealing with them in a way that has called forth the approval of men who look at these matters from very different standpoints.

THE first of the Bampton Lectures, at Oxford, for the present year was delivered on Sunday. The lecturer is the Rev. C. Bigg, D.D., formerly Senior Student of Christ Church, and for many years head master of Brighton College. Dr. Bigg took as his text the first verse of St. John's Gospel, and announced that his lectures would be a contribution to the history of Alexandrian Platonism in the Christian Church. He intended to trace its influence on Christian philosophy, to deal briefly with the writings of its most celebrated exponents, and to form an estimate of the services it was permitted to render to the Christian religion and to humanity. The introductory lecture was not only marked by that felicity of style which might be expected from so distinguished a scholar as Dr. Bigg, but gave promise that the course will furnish a most valuable contribution to the history of Christian thought. Although the subject was not particularly attractive to undergraduates, there was a good attendance of junior as well as senior members of the University.

For Health and Immortality.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 1886.

## CHURCH PATRONAGE.—II.

### The Social Aspect of the Question.

IT might be remarked that the House of Laymen, organised and convoked by Archbishop Benson in connection with the Convocation of the province of Canterbury, did not find the traffic in Church preferment so great a scandal as either of those purely clerical assemblies, the Convocations of Canterbury and York. This might be explained by the social grade of the majority of the members of the lay assembly, the level of which body was too *high*, both ecclesiastically and socially. It was like a House of Notables, which may, or may not, be the precursor of a States-General—of a real and genuine representation of the beliefs, opinions, and sentiments of the laity of the Church of England. Taking it for what it was—an aristocratic body, in which the sacerdotalist element in the Church of England, being the best organised, had secured much more than its due share of the representation,—it expressed very fairly the views on Church Patronage entertained by wealthy Englishmen, only faintly tinged with the ideas of ecclesiastical purism, which High Churchmen cannot dismiss entirely, without abjuring all their own fundamental principles. The majority of this assembly thought, with hardly an exception, that the best thing for the Church is to retain or place its offices in the gift of wealthy men. Several, with Mr. Beresford Hope, supported the provision in the Patronage Bill confining the right of purchasing an advowson to an owner of half the area of the parish, on the ground that it would connect the Church with property—with the land. Others, with Mr. H. Hucks Gibbs, pointed out that the land-owners did not at the present moment stand very well in popular opinion, that their influence was declining; and that therefore it would be better that ample opportunities of purchase should be afforded to capitalists, whose chief connection is not with the land—like Mr. Gibbs himself. Others, with Lord Montagu, lamented that the source of wealth, brought into the Church by those who purchased presentations or advowsons for their sons or themselves, should be cut off, and that thus the connection between the Church and the wealthier classes should be weakened. We are inclined to exclaim, as we read these and similar expressions of opinion, Where have these gentlemen been living in the past few months, that they have so completely failed to discern the signs of the times? Do they not see that the power of the landed aristocracy, and that of the moneyed classes in general, is gone with last winter's snows, and never can come back again? We may find ourselves any day under the sway of a despot—in fact we have practically reached that state of things already—but, under an aristocracy or a plutocracy, we can never come again. The last county elections told the tale, sad to our Conservative instincts, but unmistakably true, that the period of nobility and squire-archy in England is closed. Democratic County Government is the only thing that is yet wanted to consummate the change, and that mode of organisation the Liberals are pledged to demand, and the Conservatives to surrender. This being, evidently, the present state and future prospects of our country, is it not madness to chain our Church to the dying influence, instead of attaching it to the living and progressive one? We do not love Democracy; none dislikes it more than the writer of these lines, and none deplores more the reckless agitations, harangues, and intrigues of Mr. Gladstone, whose personal ambition, and vanity, and lust of power, have hastened the inevitable revolution by some scores of years, and reduced us to our present state of confusion and almost despair. But there Democracy is, and we must reckon with it. Demos is king, and we must find some means of existing under his sway. If the people are to continue with the Church, they must have, and will have, a voice in the disposal of her offices, especially those in which they are most immediately interested. They must, in some form or other, control the appointment of the parochial clergy. Such appointment can only be carried into effect with decency and intelligence by means of a Board of Patronage, elected by them, and possessing their confidence. Let our readers make up their minds to this great change, whether they like it or not; at any rate let them examine carefully a proposition which we formulate for their consideration. The social changes of our time have rendered the abolition of private patronage an absolute necessity. That institution may have had its uses in feudal and semi-feudal times, but those uses have ceased with the aristocratic period to which they belonged; it is now an anachronism, and the only thing remaining for consideration is how the inevitable abolition may be effected with the greatest benefit and the least injury to the Church; and how the more democratic institution which is to succeed it may be guarded against the evils which beset democracy.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### HOSPITALS AND ORPHANAGES.

SIR,—Self-help is a subject which you impress on the readers of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT. May I ask your kind aid in putting forth some ideas about Hospitals and Orphanages, and the duty (as it seems to me) on the part of the whole nation, to support these at the national expense. This may not be considered "self-help;" but surely it may be fairly so called, in cases where all contribute to objects in which all may claim a share of the benefits, if obliged to claim them. Two objections may be raised, first it is not just to increase national taxation; second, it would interfere with public benevolence; which would not be right.

1. Let me take the objection, as to the injustice of increasing national taxation. The justice or injustice of this must depend entirely on the objects. There is no difficulty made now about taxation to insure the whole rising generation being instructed, nor do we complain, but rather approve of its being compulsory. The injustice arises when the outlay is extravagant and unnecessary, and compulsion harshly carried out. I think your readers will admit the extension of this illustration to the relief of the suffering and the bereaved. I can give two instances, pointing to the necessity of national orphanages and justifying my view of national support, within my recent and personal knowledge. An officer died very suddenly. He retired from the army as a captain, with no opportunity of saving. He left six children wholly unprovided for; the friends have their own responsibilities; they are unable pecuniarily to help the orphans, but such help as they can give they are giving. A schoolmaster last week took a short cut through the Forest of Dean. He fell into an old quarry and was killed. He left eight children, the eldest eleven years of age, the youngest four weeks; God help them! "England expects every man to do his duty," but nationally she ignores her orphans, leaving them to philanthropists. I don't think any man with a spark of feeling as to what is just and right, would say—let them go to the workhouse. On the other hand, whose duty is it to provide for such cases? The relatives in such bereavements of course are expected to do all they can, and they do it, the poor help the poor; wealth and sense of duty provide much relief for orphans, but, after all exertions made, there will be many cases in which some poor bairns are left out in the cold. Is there no national duty in such cases? I have not begun with arguing the justice of the nation supporting hospitals, though I place hospitals first. Can any man object to hospitals being supported by the nation? It seems to me self-evident that every one should contribute compulsorily to hospitals. Much can be said about hospitals. The inadequate support they receive is too apparent; this comes partly from want of sympathy with suffering humanity, partly from many enjoying exemption from disease and accidents, and having sufficient to meet these troubles (forgetting how many are worse off), and lastly, from obliviousness of the fact that the skilled knowledge for which some can pay is obtained chiefly in the hospital wards, fever wards, casualty wards, from operations on others, promoting timely deliverance from suffering. All this blessed knowledge to help poor humanity in suffering, is at the service and goes to bless ninety-nine people out of every one hundred who never give a penny to bless others thus, or to pave the way for these blessings being widely available. I have tried to answer the first objection, that it is not *just* to throw the support of hospitals and orphanages on the taxation of the whole population of England.

2. Allow me to attack the second objection; it would not be *right* to do this, because it would interfere with public benevolence. It would not be unfair to answer, admit the *justice* of the thing (in these two cases), and you must also admit that it is right to levy contributions from the whole population in aid of objects affecting the whole nation. Is the help precariously given to hospitals and orphanages *public* benevolence? It certainly is not. The "public," the "masses," have very little part or lot in supporting these institutions. The hospitals and orphanages of our United Kingdom are mainly supported by the few, not by the many; every one who knows anything of public support to philanthropic objects knows that fact. It is utterly wrong that the very persons most assisted should give little or nothing to these objects; the persons who admit the justice and duty of giving help ought to be made to carry out their conscientious convictions by contributing something. I cannot think that those who now aid such objects would cease to contribute if these objects were "nationally supported." To argue this would be to discount the public spirit and Christian action of a great many contributors in the middle and upper classes to hospitals and orphanages. If I venture to make suggestions, which refer to the support of these institutions, I am bound to suggest ways and means, for I can see nothing unjust in levying a poll tax of one shilling a head on the whole population of 30 millions, which would produce £1,500,000 per annum. If any "working man" says, "How unjust to tax me the same as the upper classes," I can only reply, for such national objects I cannot see any injustice in the same payment being made by every one, single or married, and having large families. In the case of the well-to-do, *no advantage would be taken of such institutions.* The real gainers would be the majority of the population. This poll tax of one shilling per head, would simply mean a national insurance for the poor and friendless of all classes, against accidents in life and neglect and misery when children were left helpless orphans. Such institutions, nationally supported, ought to be open to all classes and all cases; rigid inquiry could show what help was necessary. In the case of orphans, of course there would be a limiting age, when they were received, and obliged to go forth and work for their own support. Where persons left an orphan family, having friends able to do something but not much, a committee of inquiry would decide whether one payment of £100 or £50 could be given towards the maintenance and education of the orphans, or a small annual payment instead. And these should be admitted into institutions of a superior class, so as not to degrade the children in their own eyes. Then would they be prepared to follow (if talent and character enabled them) the line of life of their fathers.

If these ideas of "nationalising" two of our greatest institutions were carried out, the working classes re-

quiring hospital aid need not go in search of "in-door or out-door tickets." A doctor's certificate would immediately give them the right of entrance. As to orphanages, how much expense and disappointment in canvassing might be avoided! No sensible man would wish by "nationalising" these institutions to interfere with private benevolence. I would not that Government should interfere with the noble orphanages founded and sustained by Churchmen and Nonconformists. They might very well have an annual subsidy, and yet be left under their own management and religious training.

I hope, sir, if these views meet the eye of any "working man," with a family of ten children, he will weigh them fairly; let him weigh the present hardship of his wife having to trudge about begging for an in-door or out-door ticket for her husband or her children, and often not able to obtain one; let him think of the anxiety which has oppressed his heart when he thought of his children being left fatherless. Against this, let him place a small tax of twelve shillings a year, representing assurance that in accident, in disease, or in bereavement, there will be help for him and his, to which he has contributed, to which men, women and children in his nation have helped; help which he and his may claim as a matter of right and not of charity. If the family was over a certain number, the payment might well be reduced, making the maximum payment six shillings. This would reduce the balance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but still the sum collected would suffice; for existing institutions only require sufficient subsidy to meet their present needs. The unsatisfactory results of "Hospital Sunday" would no longer trouble us, and hospitals and orphanages be erected where they are needed. To these would go the help of the whole nation. My idea is *National Co-operation* (compulsory I own), yet not unfair, for the poorer majority would be most benefited, the better off, much less so.

A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, Gloucestershire, March 3rd, 1886.

## THE BLACK RUBRIC AGAIN.

SIR,—In reading from time to time the letters from Kildare on the Black Rubric, and the Roman dogma which it controverts, the thought has several times come into mind that the writer's polemic would be more forcible, if he had a clearer idea of what the Roman dogma really is. Both among Protestants and Romanists there are current rough, popular notions of the dogma; and the Roman Church, *more suo*, has in some degree countenanced these, for the sake of the uneducated; as in the famous miracle of Bolsena, when, to convince a sceptic, the wafer, on being broken after consecration, is said to have sweated real blood, —a phenomenon in flagrant contradiction of the dogma. But for serious controversy it is not the popular conception that must be discussed, but the statement put forth by the Church's authorised teachers.

Looking at the latest of the letters to which I refer, it seems plain that the writer takes the Roman dogma to be capable of being stated in this way:—"The bread and wine in the Eucharist are, by the words of consecration, changed into the natural Body and Blood of Christ." But no competent Roman theologian, I feel sure, would accept that formula. What his Church says is that "the substances of the bread and the wine are transubstantiated respectively into the substances of the Body and the Blood of Christ." This is a very different thing, and to understand the difference it is necessary to get hold of the meaning of the word *substance* in the Roman theology.

The Roman dogma is based on a certain philosophic doctrine of matter. According to it any portion of matter is a compound of two things which belong to entirely different classes, and are capable of separation from each other. One is called the *substance* of the matter, the other is the aggregate of the *accidents* of the matter, the former term meaning what *lies under* the visible matter as its essence, the latter what is *added* to that to make up what our senses perceive. The *substance* is entirely supersensible, an object of faith alone, a purely metaphysical entity, of the nature of which it is impossible to know anything. The *accidents*, on the other hand, are the aggregate of everything which our senses can perceive in the given portion of matter. They comprise its form, size, density, texture colour, smell, taste, and every chemical or mechanical property that may belong to it. Now, if we put these conceptions into a modern dress, it is plain that the *accidents*, not the *substance*, are what we mean when we speak of matter; and that the *substance* is a sort of imaginary spirit or soul, pervading invisibly the thing of which our senses are cognisant. When, therefore, the substance of one piece of matter is said to be transubstantiatiated into the substance of another piece of matter, the only change which is asserted is the substitution of one metaphysical figment for another—of one imaginary spirit or soul for another—the visible matter itself, in our modern sense of the term, remaining exactly what it was at first. But on the theory that the metaphysical entity is really the essence of the matter, and that all the perceptible properties are nothing but a non-essential draping of it, the change which takes place in transubstantiation is held by the theologian to be an absolute change of the matter itself, although none of the sensible properties of the matter is in any degree changed.

Applying these distinctions to the Roman dogma, we see that by the transubstantiation of the bread is meant a change of the imperceptible, metaphysical entity, underlying the matter of the bread into the imperceptible, metaphysical entity underlying the matter of the Body of Christ, the bread in all other respects remaining unaltered. The bread, in this sense, is then said to have become the body of Christ. But it is clear, that the bread has not become the *natural* Body of Christ; for His natural Body has form, dimensions, density, texture, and a host of other material attributes which are expressly excluded from His presence in the Eucharist. Accordingly the Roman dogma defines the presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament of the Altar, as the presence of the *substance* of His Body under the *species*, or natural form, appearance and qualities, of the bread. And the entire process is as follows. The force of the consecrating formula, *Hoc est corpus meum*, instantaneously changes the invisible essence of the bread into the invisible essence of the Body of Christ; and the law of concomitancy at the same moment brings the invisible essence of the Blood of Christ, His human soul, and His divine nature, to join the invisible essence of His Body, and thus produces the whole Christ sacramentally, not in a natural manner, not under His own proper *species*, but under the *species* and in the guise of natural bread.

Such is the upshot of the theory, as far as one can

express such a transcendental thing in common words. The unreasonableness of it is not, I think, to be found where it has often been said to lie, in its contradicting the testimony of our senses, because the change which it affirms to take place, does not lie in the region of sense at all. Where it fails is in the theory of matter on which it is based. Of that theory there is no evidence, it was a figment of the Schoolmen, and it is utterly obsolete; from the region of natural philosophy it has clean vanished, as much as the vortices of Descartes, or the epicycles of Ptolemy. The dogma is consequently left in the air, and has become a tissue of words which have lost their meaning. The real, spiritual presence of Christ to devout partakers of the Eucharist remains, of course, as true as ever; what has passed away is the rationalistic explanation invented by the fathers of the Scholastic Theology to define it and account for it.

PRESBYTER.

## THE WELSH CHURCH CASE, AND THE IRISH.

SIR—When Mr. Gladstone planned to degrade our Church, of sixth century antiquity, he was urged on by the plaudits of the two leading Church papers of England. We told them at the time that their own turn would come next. They tried to shew that there was a difference. But no such difference is now recognised. Like case, like rule, as the courts say.

2. There was pleaded the historic difference. The Irish Church was planted here by Elizabeth to convert Romanists, whereas the English and Welsh Churches were the original bodies in the country. This was Mr. Gladstone's romance, backed up by the *Guardian* and the *Church Times*. But this is a figment, as Henry II. and Strongbow found us here, and tried to bow our necks to the yoke of Rome. All this is now as well known as that English invaders came here at all. Indeed, it is now pretended that both the English and Welsh Churches were also set up at the Reformation to convert the Romanists. But these excuses for plunder are easily seen through.

3. In this week's number of a contemporary, there is an attempt to show a difference, so that the Welsh Church should stand though ours justly fell. It is very ingenious, but it is invalid, "the Church in Wales is still the largest religious body in the principality, so that none of the competing sects can claim to occupy its place; while their own divisions bar them from any right to be taken as representing a single interest, as the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland did, when the question arose there." What does this defence amount to? This, that if any one sect in Wales was more numerous than the Church, the Church might justly be robbed and degraded! Suppose there was in India an endowed Christian Church, endowed by the voluntary gifts of its members, this Church might be justly robbed because Hindoos or Mahometans outnumber it. This is extraordinary religion, and extraordinary law and justice.

4. The Welsh case is much worse than ours. England would not allow us to use the Irish language in service. She did not prevent the Welsh clergy. We were never fairly in possession of our flocks. Though the Pope allowed them for ten years to attend church, for political reasons, he then ordered them out; and not being allowed the use of the Irish language, or Irish speaking clergy and Bishops, we could not prevent them. But the Welsh clergy once had their flocks, and Welsh service books and language to use towards them. Yet they lost their flocks; so they are much less excusable than we. If Wales can plead no better excuse, I fear her fate will be the same as ours. After Wales will come England's own turn. Her best plan would be to acknowledge her sin as to us. Then she may look to God to help her. So says David, "I will confess my sins unto the Lord, and so thou forgavest the wickedness of my sin." Till England, and its High Church people and periodicals, own and lament the sacrilegious robbery of the sacred property of God, then I see not how anything but vengeance can be expected. So long as they defend their cruel wrong to us, so long do they provoke God, and render it impossible to make out any plea for themselves that was not equally valid for us. I may observe, as to our boycotted Irish language, that when Bishop Bedell advocated Irish Bible and Prayer Book, and Irish speaking clergy, he was opposed and out voted by Lord Straford. Lord Straford, in this point mistaken, was perhaps the best English ruler we ever had. I may say he lost his life for us. He made the second Earl of Cork disgorge his Church spoils and Lord Cork hunted him to death out of revenge.

5. When Mr. Gladstone robbed us, he threw us on the alms of our laity, with our laity at liberty to invent a constitution for us. This constitution, thus forced upon us, gives the patronage of parishes to Nomination Boards. This throws the power virtually into the hands of farmers. This is sad: but who is to be blamed for it but Mr. Gladstone and his English backers up? Hear what your contemporary says, without a word of confession, as to their own part in our degradation and slavery. "We are glad to see that no time was lost in repudiating the notion that any good could come from Boards of Nomination after the Irish pattern. From what we hear, they form the most pernicious result of Irish disestablishment, and are rapidly reducing the Irish clergy to a painfully low level. To all appearances, when the men of the old generation have passed away, the clergy of the Irish Church will be simply contemptible. The best Irishmen will come to England, and leave nothing but what is poor and refuse for service at home." This is sanctimonious and full of pity. But why was it not foreseen when Mr. Gladstone and the English papers planned our robbery? What else could there be, but that we should be the creatures of our paymasters, the laity? This should have been foreseen, and should have prevented the plunder of God and His Church. Holy Writ taught what would happen when a Church is beggared. "Put me in one of the Priest's offices, that I may eat a piece of bread." It well becomes those who did the mischief, to pretend to bewail what their own hands have brought about.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

## THE PROPOSED NEW B.D. AT DURHAM.

SIR,—In reference to the announcement which appears in your last issue, will you allow me to make known that the necessary formalities for initiating the new methods of taking B.D. cannot be completed this term; but it is expected that full particulars will be published before the Long Vacation?

I have no authority to make an official statement; but I believe that those clergymen who wish to begin work at once with a view to this degree, will do well to devote themselves to St. John's Gospel, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians; and in the Old Testament, to the First Book of the Psalms and the first half of Isaiah, *either* in the Hebrew *or* in the LXX. and Vulgate.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Durham, March 14th.

## FREE TRADE.

SIR,—Mr. Gurney has started a very important topic and it is hoped it may be well taken up in your columns. Let me mention an excellent paper, "The Farmer," price one penny, 291, Strand, in which depression in trade is well discussed in the last issue, March 8th. I take it in and give it to a farmer in my parish. There is a very good letter in the "Record," March 12th, dealing with the question of corn-growing in England, handicapped as the land is by taxation.

P.

March 13th.

THE Rev. Thomas Moore, in accordance with the wishes of the Bishop, and under the auspices of the Church Defence Institution, has been engaged for the last three weeks in delivering lectures and addressing conferences of the clergy and laity in the populous centres of the Diocese of Llandaff. Mr. Moore's lectures have been explanatory of the origin, growth, organisation, continuity, and history of the Church in this country, and the sources from which she obtained her property in buildings, lands, and tithes. His addresses to the conferences have been on the best ways and means of diffusing information about the Church, and defending her when attacked. Everywhere the greatest interest has been excited, and an earnest desire for more information on these subjects has been expressed. This week Mr. Moore begins a similar three weeks' Mission in the diocese of St. David's.

BURIAL REFORM.—Last week a council-meeting of the Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association was held at the office of the Society, 16, King Street, Cheapside, Captain Coates presiding. It was felt that the Church should justify her position as the great national undertaker, by proving herself able to dispose of the dead in a better way than can be done by any other agency, in whatever aspect the subject be regarded, religious, sanitary, economic, or æsthetic. It was therefore resolved to make an earnest appeal for further subscriptions of 5s. each, and to hold meetings in every diocese if possible, before another general election. The following letter was read from the Bishop of Peterborough:—"An expensive coffin designed to delay the return of 'dust to dust,' which, for the health of the living, and, even in pity for the poor remains of mortality, we should rather seek to hasten, mourning coaches drawn by long-tailed horses, hired mourning cloaks, and complimentary scarves and hat-bands make up the most grotesque contrivance for honouring the dead at the cost and risk of the survivors that can well be imagined. Such funerals are neither sensible, solemn, nor Christian. They are really survivals of Paganism, with its horror of death as the end of all, and its dark unconsciousness of that 'sure and certain hope' which or us Christians sheds its tender light upon the grave, while in their utter unmeaningness they fall below the grim significance of the old Pagan rites, which at least had a meaning, though often a terrible and repulsive one."

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barker, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Rector of Coltenham; Perpetual Curate of Grassendale.
Bell, Rev. Edward J., Rector of Alderley; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cheshire, Mr. F. D. Brocklehurst.
Edmunds, Rev. Charles, M.A., Perpetual Curate of All Saints', Leyton.
Elliott, Rev. T. H., Vicar of St. Paul's, Tavistock.
Faraker, Rev. Robert, Minister of Emmanuel Church, Paddington.
Field, Rev. Augustus, M.A., Vicar of Lydbury North with Norbury.
Frewer, Rev. G. Ernest, Rector of Fulletby, Lincolnshire; Rector of Brede, Sussex.
Harper, Rev. H. B., Chaplain to the *Duncan*.
Howard, Rev. A. W., M.A., Vicar of Pickhill, Thirsk; Honorary Secretary for the Universities Mission in the Archdeanery of Richmond.
Isabell, Rev. John, Curate of Padstow; Rector of St. Sennen's, Land's End, Cornwall.
Johnson, Rev. J. E. S., Chaplain to the *Cleopatra*.
Johnstone, Rev. Charles James, M.A., Curate of Marden, Wilts; Vicar of Milton Abbas.
Kelly, Rev. R. C. N., late Senior Curate of Hitchin; English Chaplain in Cassell.
Margetts, Rev. William John, Vicar of St. Edmund's, Leeds; Rector of Toynton St. Peter with Toynton All Saints.
Meyrick, Rev. Morris, M.A., Vicar of Northmoor, Oxon.
Nunneley, Rev, Frederick Barham, Perpetual Curate of Bobbington.
Peach, Rev. Philip Herbert Wentworth, B.A., Vicar of Pawlet.
Rice, Rev. A. C. H., Chaplain to the *Hotspur*.
Ricketts, Rev. Martin Henry, M.A., Prebendary of Preston Wynne in Hereford Cathedral.
Roe, Rev. Robert J., Rector of St. Sennen's, Land's End, Cornwall; Rector of Lanteglos and Advent-cum-Camelford.
Rogers, Rev. Herbert Goodenough, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Salisbury; Surrogate, Diocese of Salisbury.
Rogers, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Roxwell; Public Preacher, Diocese of St. Albans.
Ross-Lewin, Rev. R. O'D., Chaplain to the *Audacious*.
Scott, Rev. Joseph Downs, Perpetual Curate of Hopton Cangeford.
Smith, Rev. E. Snowdon, Rector of St. Mary's, Wavertree; Vicar of St. Philip's, Litherland, Liverpool.
Thomas, Rev. John William, B.A., Curate of Llandudno; Vicar of Rhosymedre.
Wickham, Rev. Horace Edward, Rector of St. Mary's, Stamford.
Wilson, Rev. Canon S. Lea, Vicar of Prestbury, Macclesfield; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cheshire, Mr. F. D. Brocklehurst.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Buckeridge, Rev. Arthur Nugent, at Bath, on the 11th inst., aged 77.
Isard, Rev. James Chapman, eldest son of the late James Isard, Esq., of Meadow Lawn, Tonbridge, at 18, Victoria Park, Dover, on the 3rd inst., aged 59.
Neve, Rev. Charles, M.A., of Exeter College, Oxon, eldest son of Richard Neve, Benenden, Kent, and late Curate of Woolston, Southampton, at St. Leonard's, on the 12th inst., aged 27.
Robbins, Rev. William, M.A., thirty-five years Vicar of Shropham, on the 4th inst., aged 73.
Simpson, Rev. Canon, LL.D., J.P., Vicar, at the Vicarage Kirkby Stephen, on the 9th inst., aged 66.
Wilson, Venerable Archdeacon James, M.A., at Broomfield, Christchurch, Canterbury, New Zealand, on January 16th, aged 72.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE BAPTISMAL INHERITANCE.

BY THE LORD BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

THE SUBSTANCE OF A SERMON PREACHED AT PETERBOROUGH, ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 28TH, 1886.

"For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in Heaven and earth is named"—Ephesians iii. 14, 15.

I SPOKE to you, my brethren, last Sunday of our name, our Christian name, and I sought to show you that that is our true and real name, that it is our abiding name, because it expresses for us the most true and real fact in our life and history, the most true and real of all facts, and the most abiding—our relationship to God, our membership in the eternal kingdom of God our Father and in the family of our Lord Jesus Christ. That is the meaning of the Christian name, the name whereby we are called—it is that which testifies that we are members of the family of Christ. Now, I have to ask you to-day to consider with me when and how we become members of that family. Our Church teaches us that it is at our baptism—"My baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven"—and that we come into the family of God at our baptism. A Christian man is a christened man, and every christened man is a Christian. So for the word baptism we frequently use the word christening—that is, being made a Christian. What is a Christian then? A Christian is a man who by baptism is admitted into the family of Christ. What is a Christian then? I repeat it—every christened man is a Christian. I dare say many here will say: What a strange low picture, or idea of Christianity that is! Do you mean then to say that a Christian man is nothing more than a christened man? I am very far indeed from saying that; for he ought to be a great deal more than that; but he is that, and it is christening which makes him a Christian. More than that, he ought, as a Christian, to walk worthy of the vocation wherein he is called; but the vocation is one thing, and to walk worthy of it is another and a subsequent thing. He must be called first to be a Christian, and after that he may walk as a Christian. To be a child of God's family does not mean him to be a good and holy child. A man becomes a member of God's family and therefore a child of God in the hour of his baptism; but that does not mean that he will afterwards be an obedient, a loving, holy child, such as a Christian ought to be—that is quite another thing. If you ask me, for instance, what is an Englishman? Would you think I were giving you a true answer if I were to say an Englishman is a loyal, patriotic, law-abiding, peaceful subject of the Queen? You would at once say that is not a true description of an Englishman. But it tells you what an Englishman ought to be, and what I trust most of us are. But what makes a man an Englishman? It is being born upon English soil—that is, born in England. And so it is with regard to Christianity. A man is born a Christian in the day and hour of his being baptised, although it does not follow that he is a good and law-abiding Christian; but every man who is baptised is truly and really born into the family of God, the same way that a man who is born in England is born into the citizenship of the English nation. Every baptised man is a Christian, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven. Is that true according to our Lord's idea of His family? Is that true according to Scripture? Can a bad man be a Christian? Undoubtedly he can be. Can he be a member of Christ? Our Lord says so. He says, "I am the Vine, ye are the branches." Every branch must be a member of the vine, surely, and yet He goes on to speak of branches in Him, which do not bear fruit, and those branches are taken away and burnt. They may be bad, or rotten, or unfertile branches of the vine, but they are branches all the same. There may be good and bad fishes in the net, but when the net is drawn ashore, the bad are thrown away; but they are in the net just the same. Do we not read, "Have I not called you twelve and chosen you, and one of you has a devil." In the very beginning of Christ's Church, when membership was confined to twelve men, one of them had a devil. It is clear, then, that a man may be a member of Christ's visible Church on earth, he may be a member of Christ and a child of God, but he may also be a bad member and a disobedient and sinful child. Our Church, then, rightly as we hold, teaches us according to Scripture, that everyone entering into Christ's family by baptism becomes a member of Christ and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven. Now, there is another idea or theory of the family of Christ very different from this; it is that a man becomes a member of Christ and a child of God only when he becomes a spiritual or "converted" man. According to this idea God is not a man's Father until he has been converted and turned to God. Now, God forbid that I should say one word in disparagement of conversion to God, for it is the turning of the soul to God the Father, it is the bringing the man nearer to his Saviour. And it is the Divine will that every sinful man may be converted. But what is conversion. It is the turning of man to God, not in order to make God his

Father, but because God is his Father. What is it turns the heart of man to God if not this? I have a Father in Heaven, and I am His child, and Christ died for me; I am a member of His family, and yet I have been sinning against Him. I will arise and go to Him, to my Father. When the Prodigal son was tired of his sinful indulgence, did he say he would arise and go to some one who would say that he would be made his father? This would never have brought the Prodigal son out of the far country. He said, "I will arise and go to *my* Father," and it was because he was his Father that he desired to go to him. Conversion does not make men God's children; it makes them His good, repentant, and returning children; but they are His children first, and it is important that they should remember this fact. They may only become members by being first baptised. In the first place their faith of sonship, and the knowledge that God is their Father, depend not upon some fact, certain and positive, but upon something which they may have felt years ago. Now, it is always difficult to know how we feel or how we did feel, and what is more, others cannot be sure of a man's conversion; and in order to make themselves sure of it, they oblige him to tell them when and where he was converted, and the visible signs, and thus it becomes with them a violent, a noisy, a convulsive conversion, instead of being a gradual, gentle, tender turning of the heart slowly, and with many turnings back, it may be, until, at last, it reaches the Father's footstool. It is not then, we think, so safe a thing to rest upon our feelings as it is upon the simple fact that He has received us into His family by baptism in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. In the last place, remember what a difference it makes when we press religion upon men. What a difference it makes when we are able to say, "You are consecrated to God in your Baptism." Your life is a consecrated life, though you may not have known it. Every act of that life ought to have been holy. Why? Because you are God's consecrated and devoted child. You do not become His child when you are converted, but by being converted you turn back to Him again because you *are* His child. Walk worthy of your birthright because you are a christened child of God, a member of Christ. It makes your whole life holy in purpose and character, although it may not be so in fact, but it makes it holy from the very first moment of your baptism; and so you see the very first idea of our Church is, we venture to think, the idea of Scripture, the idea of Christ Himself, that in our baptism we become members of Christ, we become each one of us a child of God, and lastly, we become an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven. It does not mean a man who has a chance or hope of going to Heaven when he dies, but a man who is an inheritor of it. A baptised man is come into it and has the whole of God's kingdom on earth, and therefore expects to have a greater share of Heaven hereafter. He is an inheritor of Heaven, an inheritance that has come down from Christ and the Apostles through all the ages; the great, glorious kingdom of Heaven, with all its powers, and privileges, and joys, and the Divine Presence that is in it for him, and the blood of Christ is in it to cleanse away all sin in him, and the Holy Spirit of God to sanctify him. Man has inherited that kingdom, which has come down to him from his spiritual ancestors, and is a child of God, and is given the great heritage of the kingdom of Heaven. Wherefore, my brethren, now that you are children of God and inheritors of Heaven, bow your knees to the Father, and Lord, and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and thank Him for the great mercy that He has not left it to your choice, but has appointed it for you in His providence that as a fact—not depending on your will or choice—He has admitted you after your baptism into the great family of Christ, after Whom the whole family of Heaven and earth is named.

## SWEDENBORG AS AN INTERPRETER OF SCRIPTURE.

By the Rev. GEORGE W. ALLEN, Curate of St. Andrew's, Holborn, E.C.

A Paper Read before the Junior Clergy Society.

Emanuel Swedenborg,* the eldest son of Jesper Swedberg, Bishop of Skara, and of his first wife, Sarah Behm, daughter of Albert Behm, Assessor of the Board of Mines, was born at Stockholm on the 29th of January, 1688, and died at London, in a house near Coldbath Fields, in the year 1772, in the 85th year of his age.

He had during life an European reputation as a scientist and philosopher. Of his childhood and youth little is known beyond the fact that his mind was early occupied with religious subjects, and that even in boyhood he had grasped the idea that the theological dogma of justification by faith is true or false according as faith is understood to be a life of charity towards our neighbour, or an assent to a form of words, valuable only as proof of the submission of the intellect.

Swedenborg—or Swedberg, as he was at this period,—was educated at the University of Upsala. He was uncommonly assiduous in the study of the learned languages, mathematics, and philosophy. At the age of twenty-two he took his degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and published his first essay.

The year after this, 1710, Swedberg came to England, where he spent some time at Oxford. He afterwards travelled in France and Switzerland, returning to Sweden in 1714. In 1715 he published several works, one of which was a record of scientific inventions and experiments, including some of his

* This sketch of the outlines of the life of Swedenborg is taken from the English Cyclopædia, Biography Division, Art. "Swedenborg."

own. In the following year he was invited by Polhem, the great Swedish engineer, to repair with him to Lund to meet the King, Charles XII., who was so struck by him that without any solicitation he appointed him Assessor in the Royal Metallic College of Sweden.

In the year 1718 Swedberg executed a work of the greatest importance during the memorable siege of Frederickshall, by transporting over mountains and valleys, a distance of fourteen miles, on rolling machines of his own inventing, two galleys, five large boats, and a sloop. In the following year he published several works, among which were, "The Art of Rules,"—a treatise on algebra, in which (it is said) the first account was given in Sweden of the Differential and Integral Calculus; "Attempts to Find the Longitude of Places by Means of the Moon;" "A Proposal for a Decimal Coinage;" "A Treatise on the Position and Motion of the Earth and Planets;" "Proofs, derived from Appearances in Sweden, of the Depth of the Sea, and the great Force of the Tides in the Earliest Ages;" "A Mode of Constructing Docks;" "A New Way of Making Dykes;" "A Mechanical Method of Testing the Powers of Vessels;" "Prodromus Principiorum," etc.

In 1719 he was ennobled by Queen Ulrica Eleanora under the name of Swedenborg. From this time he took his seat with the nobles of the Equestrian Order in the triennial assemblies of the States. His new rank conferred no title beyond the change of name, and in his own country he is always spoken of as "the Assessor Swedenborg."

In 1724 he was invited by the Consistory of the University of Upsala to accept the professorship of pure mathematics, but he declined the honour. In 1729 he was admitted a member of the Royal Academy of Science at Upsala. In 1734 he published his "Opera Philosophica et Mineralia," in three volumes folio. His reputation was now established throughout Europe. Foreign *literati* eagerly sought his correspondence. The Academy of Science of St. Petersburg appointed him corresponding member. In 1741 he became by invitation Fellow of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Stockholm. He published in 1740-1 his "*Oeconomia Regni Animalis*," a large work, discussing at length both physiology and psychology.

In 1745 he published a work entitled, "*De Cultu et Amore Dei*." "This book," says his biographer, "is a sublimation of Swedenborg's scientific system, with a correlative statement of his psychical doctrines, in which both are blended and clothed with a narrative form." It formed a link between his physiology, and a class of doctrines which were yet to come.

Thus far we have traced the life of one now remembered only as a mystic and seer, and found only the pragmatical philosopher and man of science, writing on the construction of docks, of stoves and of dykes, and on the decimal coinage; a respected member of scientific societies, and a painstaking assessor in the Board of Mines. But latterly his scientific inquiries had turned towards physiology. Examination of the human body had suggested thoughts as to the human soul, and as in those days a science of psychology was scarcely possible, he soon found himself driven from experiment to introspection, from the common ground of positive science to the debateable land of reflection and intuition.

I have dwelt at some length on the details of this first part of his career, in order to show that Swedenborg was not a man of no scientific ability, who found it easier to think than to study, to evolve truth from his own inner consciousness than with pains and labour to investigate it in nature. Persons of purely scientific habit of mind not uncommonly regard mystics as fools, who have not the abilities requisite for men of science. This reproach at least cannot be urged against Swedenborg.

The new departure (as we may call it) in Swedenborg's life happened in his fifty-eighth year (1745). In April of that year (as he believed) the Lord appeared to him, opening his mental vision (as in the case of Elisha's servant) to the perception of the spiritual world, and endowing him with the gift of conversing with angels and spirits.

From this time till his death the wonderful gift was continued to him. He was in no perplexity or doubt about it; it was to him clear and indisputable. He at once returned to Sweden, and occupied himself with the study of the Hebrew language, and the perusal of the sacred Scriptures. By no skill or wisdom of his own (as he repeatedly protests), but by the grace of the Lord, the inner sense of the Scriptures was opened to him. To quote his own constantly recurring phrase, "It was given me to see."

He continued for two years to discharge the duties of assessor in the Board of Mines, but in 1747 resigned that post. His salary was continued to him as a pension, and he was allowed at his own request to decline the higher rank which was offered him on his retirement. He still continued, however, to take part in the proceedings of the Diet, and in that of 1761 he is stated by Count Hopken to have presented the best memorial on the subject of finance: a proof that his mysticism was in no way engendered of a decline in his natural faculties, and that it did not make him less capable of attending to practical matters.

1761, the date of the Memorial on Finance, brings us to his seventy-fourth year. During these later years of his life two ecclesiastics instituted a prosecution against him in the Consistory of Gottenburg, whence it was transferred to the Diet. One of these two, Dr. Ekabon, denounced his teaching as "full of the most intolerable fundamental error; seducing, heretical, and captious;" and added further, with an ingenuousness which is sweetly unconscious of its self-condemning force, that "he did not know Assessor Swedenborg's religious system, and would be at no pains to come to a knowledge of it." Swedenborg, happily, came out of this trial with safety; uncondemned by the Diet and protected by the King.

Towards Christmas, 1771, while in London, he was seized with a stroke of palsy, from the effects of which he never perfectly recovered. A report has been circulated that on his death-bed he recanted his claims to spiritual illumination, but that report is false; for Ferelius, a minister of the Swedish Lutheran Church in London, who visited him on his death-bed and administered the Sacrament to him, wrote as follows to Professor Trätgard of Greifswalde: "I asked him if he were going to die, and he answered in the affirmative. Upon which I requested him—since many believed he had invented his new theological system merely to acquire a great name (which he certainly had obtained)—to take this opportunity of proclaiming the real truth to the world, and recant, either wholly or in part, what he had advanced, especially as his pretensions could now be of no further use to him. Upon this Swedenborg raised himself up in bed, and placing his hand upon his breast, said with earnestness: 'Everything I have

written is as true as that you now behold me. I might have said much more, had it been permitted me.'"

Thus, earnestly protesting to the very last the sincerity of his own conviction of the truth of what he had stated touching the revelation vouchsafed him, passed away this remarkable man, in the eighty-fifth year of his age, to that state which—unlike most men—he would enter not as a stranger. For he had been of those, few, perhaps, though more than the world suspects, so pure and clean in life that—

> To him the wall
> That sunders ghosts and shadow-casting men
> Became a crystal, and he saw them through it,
> And heard their voices speak.

It is popularly supposed that Swedenborg founded the sect of the Swedenborgians, which calls itself the New Church, or the Church of the New Jerusalem; but this is an entire misapprehension. This sect was not founded until the year 1788, sixteen years after the death of Swedenborg. He never seceded, or thought of seceding, from the Church to which all through life he had belonged, and in which his father had been a high dignitary; and—as we have seen—on his death-bed he received the Sacrament from an authorised minister of that Church. It is important that this truth should be clearly stated, as some, were they left in the false impression, might on that ground alone be so strongly biassed against Swedenborg as a most presumptuous schismatic, that they would be quite incapable of giving his spiritual philosophy, which has very little to do with his theological tenets, an impartial hearing.

I have called my paper "Swedenborg as an Interpreter of Scripture," thus indicating at once the line to which I wish to confine myself. Swedenborg as a Theologian would undoubtedly be an interesting study, but it would be impossible to discuss both in a single paper, and as I myself am far more interested in Swedenborg as a seer than in Swedenborg as a theologian, I have preferred to take that branch of the subject which relates to interpretation, rather than that which relates to dogmatic theology.

Whatever attitude of mind my hearers may take towards mystical interpretation, I may surely assume it as a matter of course that all will be to some extent familiar with the nature and genius of this mode of interpretation. Time would fail me were I to endeavour to expound and defend mysticism as a philosophy as opposed to literalism, as well as to treat of that particular mystical interpretation to be found in the writings of Swedenborg. I will venture only to advance this: The mystical student of Holy Scripture founds his confidence of there being a hidden underlying meaning in Holy Scripture (and indeed in all phenomena) on these considerations.

Firstly, when our Lord was on earth, He found H mself obliged to use the parabolic method; so much so indeed, that it is asserted: "Without a parable spake He not unto them; but privately to His own disciples He expounded all things." Thus even the disciples differed from the general crowd—not in that they were taught immediately, without the intervention of parable, while the crowd were only taught parabolically—but, that while the crowd had the parable without any interpretation, the disciples were told the interpretation. Thus parable was the means used with both; but the people had only the earthly story, while the disciples, with the earthly story, were told its heavenly meaning.

The mystic sees in this, not the capricious choice of the Lord, but a necessity arising directly from the nature of the case. To him it is in itself, *à priori*, more probable that when God would convey heavenly truths to earthly minds, He should use the *mediate* method of parable and allegory than the contrary; and he asks, as God is one, is it so unlikely that as the Son of God taught men by His spoken word when He was here on earth, so He has ever taught men in the Holy Scriptures, which are His written word—His word, quite as much as the words men heard from His lips during His three and a-half years' ministry?

After thus endeavouring to create, by a rational consideration, a presumption, even if it be a slight one, in favour of this theory, the Mystic next proceeds to support and confirm the slight presumption thus engendered, by proving that, in the case of at least one seemingly historical and matter-of-fact incident in the Old Testament, the allegorical or mystical interpretation is asserted as the true one, on the authority of Scripture itself. Sarah and Hagar, says St. Paul, allegorically represent Jerusalem after the Spirit, and Jerusalem after the flesh. "Hagar is Mount Sinai, in Arabia." In such an audience as this, I need not go into further particulars; the context will be familiar, and the force of the Apostolic teaching at once apparent. It will be remembered, too, that the words are used in the calmest and most matter-of-course way, as conveying what is apparent to all, and that the assertion is absolutely simple and unqualified. Not "these things *might* bear this construction, if we could take them allegorically," but plainly, "*which things are an allegory.*"

But while the mystic puts forth these considerations and arguments when reasoning with literalists, who are inclined to doubt his philosophy, the reason and consideration which weighs most strongly with himself, and from which he draws his own confidence in the truth of this method of studying Holy Scripture, is the result which, when applied, he finds it yields. It can be no argument to any one else, but, for himself, he is sure that he is on the right track, because it leads to what is in the highest degree edifying and wonderful. The study of Holy Scripture on these lines becomes to him a matter of intensest delight. It conducts him to regions of which the literalist has no conception; thoughts, perceptions, high and pure, dawn upon him; difficulties dissolve, doubts melt away, the riddles of life become untangled, and its discords divinest harmonies; its darknesses he sees were only dark from excess of light; and life becomes a something too good to be uttered, too sweet to be expressed.

The enthusiasm of any art seems folly, not to the master in some other art, but only to the non-artist, the man incapable of art at all. Each artist, knowing the sweetness of his own special enthusiasm, will sympathise, rather than scorn at the—to the non-artist—seeming *exuberant folly* of a brother of some art.

If I may speak for myself Swedenborg's chief value to me has been that in his writings I find suggestions as to the possible interpretation of Scripture, whereby I am started on lines of investigation which I can pursue for myself. This I think is always the value of the true master; who desires to make of his disciples, not slaves, but brothers. Not slaves, who take everything on the authority of the master, without troubling, and indeed thinking it would be derogatory

to their master to desire, to verify for themselves—but brothers, who, the nearer they approach to the attainments of the master, will be ever the more thankful and grateful to him for having started them on a work which yields so splendid a harvest, Imitation is the sincerest flattery; and in no way can the pupil so amply repay and gratify his master as by striving to become a master himself.

Swedenborg discerned, or as he would say, to him it was given to see, that no form is an insignificant or empty thing; and just as we know that in ancient times names signified qualities, so, he asserts, do all forms, colours, and in a word all sensible impressions, signify *qualities*. Only, to ordinary eyes, the form hides and encloses the quality; while to seeing eyes, spiritually perspicuant, it reveals it.

I do not see how I can better deal with a subject really far too extensive for a single paper, than by proceeding to lay before you some examples of the application of this principle to the letter of Holy Scripture. Let me only premise that I do not expect that the mere recitation of these results will bring conviction of the soundness of the principle of mystical interpretation to any who have not gone into the question for themselves. I hope, at the utmost, to induce some to make a trial of the principle for themselves; for, as I have said, the really convincing proof of its soundness is the results to which when tried it is found to lead.

Our first illustration shall be Water. We proceed to trace its mystical significance in the Scriptures. Water, as we know it, falls in rain from heaven, and is found on earth in the spring, the stream, the river, and the sea. Spring, stream and river are fresh, save in so far as man pollutes them; the sea is undrinkable through its natural saltness.

Swedenborg takes a passage from Isaiah (xi. 9) as the key to the significance of water, "The knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea." Roughly, then, it signifies Knowledge; but as there are many forms of water, so there are many forms of knowledge. To work out Swedenborg's definition of these we must refer to Genesis i.

From this chapter we learn that there was a time when the waters existed as one—undivided, undistinguished. That then the fiat of God went forth, and separation commenced; first between the waters above and the waters below, next between the waters below and the dry land, called, by God, earth. We have thus two pairs of correlatives. The waters above and the firmanent, and the waters below and the earth.

Now as the earth symbolizes, as we shall see, the earthly nature in man, that in him which is related to the dust of the ground, called, by Swedenborg, the external man, the water on earth must be interpreted of the knowledge which pertains to this earthly external man. This earthly knowledge Swedenborg calls "Scientifics." It is necessary to get a clear understanding of exactly what he means by this term; what he includes under it, and what he does not.

Scientific knowledge, as we ordinarily use the word now, includes knowledge of the world outside us, which we attain by means of our bodily senses. It is perhaps best defined by mentioning its opposite, which is intuition. Intuition and science is, say some, a distinction without a difference; since they deny that any knowledge is properly intuitive.

But without stopping to argue this old question in philosophy, it is sufficient at present to state that Swedenborg sees a very real distinction and difference between the two. Intuition is what we know in ourselves, spontaneously and immediately, without the intervention of premises: that which we know almost without distinct consciousness that we have the knowledge—as a child knows that it loves its mother, as we know that love is better than hate, truth than falsehood. When we have thus defined intuition we may roughly class all other knowledge, which does not come under the category, as scientific. The real connotation of scientific knowledge is that it is that which requires to be retained in the memory; it is all knowledge which is not so, because we are so, all knowledge which, as far as inherent reasons go, may either be so or not be so; experiment alone determining. It thus includes all that we ordinarily call science, and also all ethical and moral precepts which are based upon authority; that is which we do not see in and of ourselves, as arising from what we are, and feel ourselves to be, but which has to be revealed to us, dictated to us, taught us, and which we have to remember.

There is a stage in our development when this distinction between science and intuition has not arisen, or rather the consciousness of it has not arisen. To a young child all knowledge is immediate. The consciousness of the gulf which separates me from the not me is yet latent; but in most persons a time comes when the distinction reveals itself with greater or less clearness. When it is fully and truly clear, it is then apparent to the mind that the intuitive is a higher order of knowledge than the scientific, that the objects cognized by intuition are nearer to my being and essence, and concern divine and abiding things. In short, one is as the waters above, the other as the waters below.

Let us study somewhat more closely these waters below. Rain aptly symbolizes the word of God. "As the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven. . . so shall my word be." "My doctrine shall drop as the rain." It comes from above, and if not actually the water above the firmament, is, of all waters, the nearest to it. It indicates that all knowledge, however it may exist in the mind, comes down from God. But once fallen upon earth it is then of the waters below; best and purest when freshly fallen, but ever deteriorating the longer it remains on earth—a fact the Church has too often shut her eyes to. Rivers and streams are the channels whereby knowledge is conveyed, and usually symbolize the delight which always arises when knowledge comes. Seas symbolize the storage of knowledge, systems of philosophy, or of theology, which is divine philosophy.

Knowledge, says St. Paul, meaning undoubtedly scientific knowledge, shall vanish away. God, we read, called the gathering together of water sea. Now, it is a significant thing that in Rev. xxi. one of the signs of the Regeneration, the new heaven and the new earth, is that "there shall be no more sea." See how prettily this works out. Scientifics we have said include knowledge depending on our senses, and knowledge depending on authority. Now the first of these shall vanish away, because the regenerated man is not to "judge after the sight of his eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of his ears." He will know interiorly and immediately. Hence we see at once the significance of "there shall be no more sea.

Again, the second of these, knowledge depending upon authority, and that we have to remember, shall vanish away, because it is written, "They shall teach

no more every man his neighbour and every man his brother, saying Know the Lord, for all shall know Me from the least unto the greatest;" and again, "I will put my law in their *heart*" (very different from in their memory). In this symbolism, therefore, of the water below, it is quite clear what is the significance of "there shall be no more sea."

Again; in the sense of *systems* of philosophy or of theology, which never are the truth, Sea cannot be a permanent thing. A man may approach and reach the truth by a right use of systems, but truth is never a system. All systems, even the best, are but "broken lights."

Yet, though not truth, they are a necessary way to the truth. Hence, when our Lord had done teaching the multitude, who were not interested in truth, He turned to His disciples and said, "Let us go over to the other side." The sea is not the truth, but the way to the truth lies across it. And so the Psalmist says that it is "they who go down to the sea in ships and do business in great waters," that "see the works of the Lord and His wonders in the deep."

"Let us go over to the other side," is ever the suggestion of Christ to earnest minds, and hearing it, we set off eagerly in search of truth, in systems, over the sea, studying this and that school of thought to find the truest; but instead of finding truth as we hoped, we find storms, doubts, difficulties, perils of faith. So the disciples found; and after all, instead of getting across the sea of ourselves, our only hope is to cry for help and saving. The sea, with its storm and danger of shipwreck, is necessary to beat out of us our self-confidence; when, abandoning this, we cry unto the Lord in our trouble, He arises from where He has withdrawn to let us try by ourselves, and as it was at His word that the winds arose, so at His word wind and wave cease. He maketh the storm a calm, and bringeth them unto the desired haven. But once on the other side, we have done with the sea—at least, with the unstable, treacherous sea: in this sense henceforth for us there is no more sea; not systems, but life; not faith, but love.

The troubled sea when it cannot rest, is compared to the wicked, symbolizing the restless unrest which ever heaves, and works, and produces nothing. The cruel inexorableness of the sea, of which Victor Hugo writes so graphically, shows how it corresponds to wickedness.

But though in the sense of troubled sea, unstable and treacherous, there shall be no more sea, yet, in the regeneration, in heaven that is, we read of a sea; but it is a sea of glass, clear as crystal, and is before the throne of God—more transparent, less unstable than the waters of earth. This sea is of the waters above, which, as we have seen, symbolise a kind of knowledge of which not every one has conscious experience here: a heavenly knowledge, which bears somewhat the same relation to earthly scientifics that thought does to words. Science is the popular idol just now. But though those whom the world reputes philosophers, declare that there is no knowledge worth the name except scientific, yet the mystic knows, on the contrary, that the reverse is the true, and that when our eyes now blind, our spiritual eyes, are opened, like the eyes of Elisha's young man, we shall then only wonder how we could have mistaken the slow, indeterminate feeling-sense of science for anything worth calling sight.

And it is most interesting to observe the following: Ordinary mortals are yet under the law, and must advance in knowledge by obedience to the schoolmaster, that is, by the methods of science. Hence water has power over us; a river, or still more the sea, stops our progress, and we are helpless before it, until we can make a boat, and even then we float on it in danger, completely in its power. But a spiritually open man, a seer, is not thus in bondage to the waters. Elijah a prophet, a man of spiritual illumination, comes to a stream which threatens to bar his passage, and simply taking his mantle, the emblem of his seership, he smites the waters, and they divide, and afford passage. So Elisha, shortly afterwards. Still more striking is the case of Christ. To Him, in power of His heavenly nature, the waters below, so unstable and fluid to us, become like the sea of glass in heaven, firm, and He can walk upon them. Whereby we see, or might see, that the qualities of things are not in the things, but in us; and when we are heavenly, earth will be to us as heaven.

Very similar is the significance of water when contrasted with wine. At the marriage of Cana there were set six water-pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews. Now, the manner of the purifying of the Jews was, we know, of outer material purification, and rested on authority. It was therefore what Swedenborg would call a scientific, and is mystically symbolized by the waters below. The sustenance of Israel in the wilderness, when the law was given, was water, and a mysterious edible they called manna. Six, again, the number of the jars, is significant of a state of disorder and incompleteness. I should make you smile if I were to say all that could be said on the symbolism of this number; but we are not concerned with numbers now. Water, then, is to purify the body; wine, to make glad the heart. There was little joy in Judaism, with its hecatombs of innocent animal victims, its formal ritual, and tedious ceremonies. So little, indeed, that, because the human heart requires joy, a direct command had actually to be given that at certain seasons and occasions the Jew was to rejoice as a matter of duty—a law which will certainly not be required in the New Jerusalem. So law is a cold, joyless thing; so are all scientifics, which all have the nature of law, and lack the Gospel. Visit the assemblies of those who call themselves Positivists, and are the devotees of science. It is like entering an ice-house. They are the spiritual teetotalers, water-drinkers. They are earnest, they are sincere, but they lack that warmth of life and joy which is ever characteristic, not of law, but of the Gospel.

Having now spoken of the division of the waters, let us study the correlative factors, firmament, and earth or dry land.

As the water and the earth were, before the third day, undifferentiated, so in our own evolution we know there was a time when we failed to be conscious of any distinction between ourselves and our knowledge. When the dry land appears, this distinction becomes manifest,

The dry land, to which sense-knowledge appertains, symbolizes the external nature in man, Swedenborg calls it briefly, "the external man." We shall only have time to refer in a very inadequate and sketchy manner, to the way in which the symbolism works out.

The first thing the dry land produces is grass, herbs, fruit-trees; vegetable life.

Vegetable life, says Swedenborg, symbolizes works done, as the man thinks, by himself, of his own will and power. Again how pretty is the working out.

This vegetation is the work of the third day, and the sun is not till the fourth. Now we know that there could be no vegetation if there were no sun; the earth could no more bring forth grass and trees without the dynamic of the sun, than man can do good works without Christ—the Sun of Righteousness, But while the earth, as it is in nature, never tries to do this impossible thing, the earth, symbolising unregenerate man, does. It requires a revelation from heaven to teach us that we are not the real authors of our good works. As far as our consciousness goes, we should be quite unaware of the fact. So the allusion to vegetation without the sun, in Genesis i., cannot refer to the material earth, where such a thing would be impossible, but must refer in a symbolistic way to man, by whom the mistake is universally made.

It is interesting, in the light of the symbolism of vegetation as signifying unacceptable works, to note that in the Levitical Law vegetables in a raw state were forbidden to be offered upon the altar. In Leviticus ii. we have the regulations of what, in the Old Version, was called the meat offering, but in the New Version is more happily termed the meal offering. If uncooked it was to consist of fine flour, oil and frankincense. If baked, of unleavened cakes mingled with oil, or unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and though (in verse 12) it is said that a sheaf of the first fruits might be presented before the Lord, it is particularly noted that it shall not be burned upon the altar.

Thus vegetation, as vegetation, evidently signifies something which God cannot accept as compatible with perfection in man. Regarded thus, what a flood of light is thrown on the story of the sacrifices of Cain and of Abel. What shifts interpreters have been put to to find some satisfying reason for the rejection of Cain and the acceptance of Abel; some assuming that Cain wilfully ignored a distinct command of God, though no trace of evidence for this can be found in the story; others content with the very obvious reflection that Cain brought his in a wrong spirit, which does not in the least help us to see how a wrong spirit is related to a vegetable sacrifice and a right spirit to an animal. But if vegetable life symbolizes the works of the external man, works of the third day when the sun shone not, and therefore done without the grace of Christ or the inspiration of His Spirit, how clear everything then is. How can God accept vegetable sacrifice; how not accept animal?

For animals, at least the animals for sacrifice, being all cattle (birds being only allowed in special cases), are all of the sixth day. But there is a higher and diviner sacrifice than even a lamb (though the Law could get no higher than the lamb), and that is the sacrifice of a man, the crown and sum of creation. Human sacrifices are of two kinds: one the most devilish, the other the most divine; the one the sacrifice of another for me, the other the sacrifice of myself for others. Christ offered to God Himself, the highest of all living things, a perfect man.

We have yet to speak of the firmament. As the waters below are to the earth, so are the waters above, to the firmament. This firmament will therefore symbolize the internal man; Heaven, the divine nature in man.

Heaven, according to the Lord's prayer, is that place where God's will is done. Man, like God, is a trinity, body, soul, spirit. The body is formed, made, or created; the soul inbreathed; the spirit born or begotten.

Sin and its consequent death pertains to the soul alone; the body indeed dies, but its death is not properly death, and is not to be feared; so we may be sure that its sin, if it be capable of sin, is not a thing to be feared. The Spirit is essentially immortal, and can neither die nor sin. For the spirit is that part of us, our true higher, inner, and as yet hidden being, which is *born* of God (not *created* or *made*), and so cannot commit sin because its divine seed remaineth; for birth is always true, the child is "*of its father.*" And as it cannot sin, it follows that it cannot die.

But what I want to point out is, that this spiritual nature is symbolised in Scripture by the expanse, the firmament, that which hangs over the earth, and in which the world, we may say, lives and moves and has its phenomenal being. The end of regeneration is, we know, at-one-ment of outer and inner, earth and heaven. But can earth ever become air, firmament? Surely not. Rather—of course not. At-one-ment is not the obliteration of all differences, but the putting of all differences in their proper relation and place, whereby arises a harmony of parts, a unification, an at-one-ment.

But earth has its hills and valleys; in it itself is found higher and lower, and the mountains are that part of earth which strain towards the heights of the firmament. Let me observe in passing, that in the Levitical Law of clean and unclean beasts, all that creep on the earth (insects, that is,) are unclean, save, by special exception, the grasshopper and the locust, because they have legs to leap withal upon the earth; they do try to rise above the dust, though but by a short-lasting leap. So even the feeblest effort after better things is accepted, and only that which never aspires at all is incapable of acceptance.

But returning to the firmament, and taking the mountains as symbolising that in man's human nature which is capable of at-one-ment with the Divine, and strains towards it, we see at once why in all Scripture prophecy the Lord's house and the Lord's city are always mountain-high. Let me refer you to some passages: Isaiah ii. 2, "The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains . . . . People shall say, Come ye and let us *go up* to the mountain of the Lord." In Ezekiel's vision of the restored Temple and city we find (chap. xl.): "He set me on a very high mountain, whereon was as it were the frame of a city." And in the Revelation, when the seer was to be shown the new Jerusalem, he was carried away in the spirit to a mountain great and high, and saw the Holy City coming down from God out of heaven. Here firmament and earth meet, earth in its mountains straining towards heaven, and heaven descending to meet and bless with itself the earth.

Such are some few of the results of the application to Scripture of the doctrine of correspondences, which is based upon the perception that form, properly, is not to conceal but to reveal spirit; that the inner and spiritual, which underlies the outer and material, embodies and expresses itself in that outer and material, which is indeed that inner and spiritual manifested outwardly and materially. The Bible, nature, and man are the work of one author, are God's three revelations; and they are *revelations* of Himself, and not *withdrawings and concealings* of Himself, still less distortions and falsifications of Himself. Rightly read they manifest Him who is the Spirit, and Author, and Substance of them all.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1886.

## CHURCH PATRONAGE.

### III.—THE MATERIAL ASPECT OF THE QUESTION.

IT is generally admitted that the traffic in Presentations and Advowsons can only be prevented by extinguishing Private Patronage. So long as these are looked upon by the eye of the law as properties, they must be liable to all the incidents of property, and remain, as now, marketable commodities. In order to take them out of the market, we must separate entirely from them the idea of property, and substitute that of trust. But the idea of property has been held by the English law for centuries, and persons have been permitted and encouraged to buy and sell advowsons and presentations, and to make them the subjects of family arrangements and other business transactions, almost as freely as any other species of property. This being the case, any enactment which would destroy or seriously diminish their marketable value would, unless accompanied by sufficient compensation, deserve the name of confiscation. It would harmonise well enough with much of the legislation of the Gladstonian epoch, but would be quite at variance with the moral law, and also with public policy. And, of all institutions in the world, the Church is most strongly bound never to found her own advantage, prosperity, or freedom, upon injustice committed towards individuals. She must therefore be prepared to purchase, out of her own worldly means, every step by which she may liberate her offices, and convert them from private properties into public trusts.

On this point we are met by some with a resolute refusal to sacrifice any of the property of the Church. Singularly enough, this refusal was as positive among the laymen as among the clergymen, and it was treated as sacrilege to divert from what are called sacred uses—viz., the support of clerical persons, and the performance of the ordinances of worship,—any properties that had once been devoted to these objects. We would ask, in reply, Are these uses so specially sacred? and is it so all-important to maintain these functionaries? Have the views of the Almighty Unchangeable changed since the days of Micah, and has he become better satisfied with burnt offering and sacrifice, than with doing His will by driving the traffickers out of His temple? And have the views of the Founder of our Faith changed since His days on earth, and has He substituted for those topics of inquiry which He said that He would put forward in solemn form at the last awful day, a something of this kind: Inasmuch as ye have decorated churches and supported clergymen, ye have done it unto Me. Religious scrupulosity could not take a more perverted form than this. It is not imaginable that property could be devoted to a more sacred object, than delivering the offices of the Church from their present bondage to filthy lucre. In those periods of Church history which our sacerdotalists most admire, it was always considered lawful to sell the goods of the Church in order to ransom captives with the proceeds. Surely it is no sacrilege, but a sacrifice well-pleasing to the Lord, to give up some earthly property appertaining to religion, in order to deliver the sacred offices of the Church from their present much more degrading condition of captivity to the Mammon of unrighteousness.

If the principle be admitted, that the Church's property may be alienated for the purpose of purchasing the liberation of her offices, the difficulties are not so great as many think. The process of liberation must be gradual, and spread over a space of several years; and if so, the sacrifice of capital would not be very great. We should propose that every Patron should be permitted to present for one turn more, and that, after that, all the appointments should go into the hands of the Board of Patronage in each Diocese. Thus the property for which compensation would be due, would be the Advowson *minus* the next presentation. Now, we believe that the usual calculation of the average respective value of these two portions of the property is, that the next Presentation is worth three-fourths of the whole Advowson. If so, one-fourth would be the figure at which the compensation might be estimated—one-fourth of the capital value of the parochial endowments of all the English parishes. Does the sacrifice seem too great to make, for the priceless blessing of having this horrid traffic, which has lowered the tone of the whole English clergy, and weakened the Church's defence against her enemies, finally abolished? We think not.

It is, however, by no means probable that the material loss incurred by the Church would be so great. For there are several set-offs, which have to be taken into consideration. A very large part of the patrons would be ashamed to accept any compensation. A few, like Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Talbot, and others in the House of Laymen, would consider such an act positively sacrilegious; and a great number would think it mean and unbecoming. When Patronage in the Church of Scotland was abolished, a great part of the patrons declined all

compensation; as did many Irish patrons, when their Church was disendowed. A Duke of Devonshire could hardly, for very shame, put into his pocket the estimated value of his thirty-eight, or an Earl of Lonsdale of his thirty-nine livings. The patrons of limited means, who had bought advowsons as property for personal or family purposes would, of course, require compensation, and receive it. Every one, in fact, would receive the full value of his property, who could bring himself to accept it.

A second set-off would be that, when private patronage has disappeared, the main difficulty in the way of equalising clerical incomes, or graduating them according to the services rendered, would be found to have vanished along with it. At present, Mr. Gladstone's son might be promoted, when four years in orders and twenty-seven years of age, to a living of £3,024, with a population of 5,623; or a relative of the Earl of Derby to one of £3,500, with a population of only 729; while others have to content themselves with curates' stipends all their lives. But, when private patronage has been abolished, there will be no more Hawardens or Winwicks, and the son or connection of the ancient noble, or of the popular demagogue, will each alike have to wait his turn, and to be paid according to his services.

A third set-off, and this by far the most important of all, is the impulse that would be given to private offerings for the support of the clergy, whether in the form of endowment or of sustentation. At present, no one thinks of supplementing the income of an incumbent, however inadequate. That has to come out of the endowment; and, if the endowment is inadequate, it is the patron who must make up the deficiency. And, if the living is in private patronage, any benefaction or bequest towards endowment would only augment the patron's property, and increase its saleable value. Such gifts, therefore, hardly ever take place. But, when the patronage has been placed in the hands of a public body, in which the persons interested in the parish have confidence, endowments of livings will prove one of the most attractive, as they are already one of the most useful, objects of liberality. The probability is, that not only would the sacrificed fourth of the benefices be replaced, but their present deficiencies largely provided for, long before the gradual liberation of the advowsons, of which we have sketched the plan, became complete.

Let our readers remember that, if, as we profess to think, the whole body of the laity is the Church, of which the clergy are merely the officials, the laymen's wealth is the Church's wealth; and it will be given cheerfully and even lavishly for every necessary purpose, if only the clergy lay themselves out to win the Church's confidence, and certain gross evils, like that which has been our subject to-day, are removed.

We propose, in our next, to venture on the knotty subject of the disposal of the liberated patronage.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### DOGMA AND PHILOSOPHY.

SIR,—The clever paper of Professor Momerie on the antagonism, presumed or real, between dogma and philosophy, seems to call for comment, and, I must add, for at least partial refutation. That no dogmas can exhaust truth must indeed be freely admitted. As an inspired apostle says, our knowledge is in part, "we see through a glass darkly." Nay, hereafter, in heaven itself, and even throughout eternity, we have strong reason to believe that knowledge will be always on the increase. The human intellect, approximating to the divine, will ever mount higher and ever remain at an infinite distance from closing with the infinite.

So also is it plain that even the strongest dogmata of revelation are relatively, rather than absolutely, true—truth as it can be expressed to us, rather than truth as it is in itself. But this being once granted, it remains a fact that our Blessed Lord's teaching is everywhere and always emphatically dogmatic, and so, in a very large measure, is that of the apostles.

Revelation and dogma are synonymous, or one, at least, involves the other. As revelation is not and cannot be complete, dogma is not and cannot be exhaustive. Human philosophy is a seeker. True theology has found the knowledge which is of God. One and all of the dogmatic statements of the creeds are the outcome of the mind of the whole Church working under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit. Our Divine Master's promise is, that His disciples should be gradually or finally led into all truth, and the very world itself is to be convinced of sin, righteousness, and judgment. The old rule is the only one to hold by. Where there is common consent, there is doctrinal truth or sound dogma. The fact that most or all of these truths have been contested, does not detract in the least from their authority, rather confirms it. Such truths are the Trinal Personality in the Unity of Godhead, the incarnation of the Everlasting Son, involving the union of two natures in one Person, and all the other doctrinal statements of the catholic creeds. This does not involve the acceptance of prevalent *definitions*, which may or may not be erroneous.

Philosophy, Aristotelian, or Hegelian, is, in my eyes, a ladder set up from earth, or on earth, resting nowhere and leading no-whither. It is, for the more part, idle cobweb-spinning, and never yielded true solace to the heart, or definite instruction to the soul. Revelation is the only divine philosophy, and that is dogma. It teaches us what we could not otherwise have known, that the All-Wise and All-Loving has provided a sovereign remedy for the world's disease in the self-sacrifice of Godhead for Its creatures' sake. Were it not for this, evil would always tend to sink to a lower and yet lower deep. The leverage for recovery could only be supplied by the Divine Maker, and was, in thought, before the world began to be. There is no afterthought in Godhead.

Human philosophy can, at the best, aspire. Dogma demands belief, and yields the guerdon of delight, when our wills close with the revealed Will of God.

Possible it is, doubtless, to use the same words in different senses. Professor Momerie seems to hold the creeds, and value them, though he depreciates dogma, that is, definite teaching as to God or the future of man, if I understand him aright. To my mind, Pyrrhonism, or universal doubt or agnosticism, is the worst of errors. Good honest bigotry is very preferable to it, but doubt has a bigotry of its own. Like the late Dean of Westminster, it is very liberal to everything but orthodoxy. The one creed to which no mercy is shown, is that of the whole Church of God throughout the world. Thus the heathen of old time tolerated the worship of all gods save that of the One Jehovah.

Far wiser and more reasonable is it to say, we have truth as far as its possession or expression is possible to us, in the creeds and the universal testimony of the whole Church of God. Vulgar errors may have been very widely spread, but they never have and never can have the mark of universal testimony.

Take the "ora pro nobis." It is expressly forbidden in the New Testament, "See thou do it not! Worship God." So is it by the early Fathers both of East and West.

Take the definition of ἀιώνιος as endless. It is distinctly forbidden by the many inspired statements of ultimate good for all. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." "God shall gather together in one all things in Christ" "God is the Saviour of all men." "God shall be All in all." "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." Hence we know for an infallible certainty that all evil will be swallowed up in good, and darkness in light. Philosophy could yield us no more than a dim hope at the best and highest.

There are subtle minds which seem unable to close with any truth, which will always far rather seek than find, and such minds may have their use, but mankind cannot build upon the quicksand of inquiry, and the waste of perpetual doubt. We must be able to say to all: This is the catholic faith, which except a man believe, he is not in the authorised way of salvation, though he possess all hope and all charity. A child of God he may be, but not the Church's child. Into God's kingdom he may come hereafter, but in heaven's kingdom he is not here.

In this sense dogma is evermore immortal, and the philosophy of sceptics and half thinkers, Hegels and Herbert Spencers, not, in my deliberate judgment, which I frankly avow, worthy of a thinking man's attention or respect.

This is no doubt a combative assertion, but it is none the less the expression of my deep conviction. It is, of course, open to Mr. Herbert Spencer and his admirers to consider me a fool, and I should be disappointed if they did not do so.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
March 13th, 1886.

P.S.—In answer to your various Irish correspondents, allow me to say simply that I have advocated local legislation for England, Scotland, and Ireland, by double local chambers, sitting for two months annually, in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, previous to the meeting of the Imperial Parliament. The upper Irish chamber would guard the interests of Ulster. Before long I believe that this principle of local legislation will be acted on for the good of all.

## FREE TRADE.

SIR,—I can understand that the importance of the question of Free Trade, bearing as it does on the well-doing of the entire population, has been your reason for admitting into your columns Mr. Gurney's letter of the 13th March. But I must protest against the tone of that letter, which is more marked by abuse than by argument. Belief in free trade has been, rightly or wrongly, for some years past, a belief of the majority of thinking men in this country; and, whether they are right or wrong in accepting it, "universal noodledom" is not a proper term to apply to them.

Mr. Gurney's feelings are moved by the suffering he sees around him, and his wrath is kindled by what he hastily concludes is the cause of that suffering. I don't know how far his memory can carry him backward, but, speaking from what is well within my own recollection, I can assure him that the suffering of the present time is trifling compared with that which existed before and for some little time after the repeal of the Corn Laws. In spite of bad seasons and competition, till within the last eighteen months the condition of the working classes of this country has been a marvellously better one than it formerly was, and even now it is not nearly as bad as it used to be. The following figures will confirm this view. The Corn Laws were repealed in 1846, the population of England and Wales at that time being about seventeen millions. In the two years before the repeal the proportion of paupers to population was 9·2 per cent., and this rose in 1848 to 11·8 per cent. On the 1st January, 1885, only 2·9 per cent. of the population was receiving relief, although that population had increased in the mean time to about twenty-seven millions, and pressure must have been in proportion.

With such an increase as this I need hardly say that it would be absurd to suppose that the soil of this country could produce the necessary food supplies. It would not only be absurd, but a *crime*, to endeavour artificially to raise the cost of those supplies. In any consideration of the subject let it be observed that the depression is not confined to this country, but affects those also which are protectionist in policy.

H. W.

March 21st, 1886.

SIR,—Your correspondent says that "no country can afford to be mainly fed or clothed by foreign countries." I am at a loss to know why. If "afford" means *economically afford*, the statement is contrary to experience; indeed is contrary to common reason, if the purchasing country has wherewithal to pay for its purchases. If it means *politically afford*, that is, that a country incurs political danger or mischief by importing its food or clothing, I suppose some kind of reasoning could be devised to establish that; but I think it is susceptible of reasonable dispute. I am tolerably well acquainted with the "wealth of nations," and I do not know the passage where Smith has "laid down expressly that every country, and Britain in particular, was bound to protect its agricultural interests, so as not to be dependent on the foreigner

for bread." If he really said so, it is a maxim of politics and not of political economy. I find in Book 4, chapter 2, what seems not consonant with it. "The freest importation of the rude produce of the soil could have no such effect" (as suffering,) "upon the agriculture of the country" (Great Britain). Also: "The free importation of foreign corn could very little affect the interest of the farmers of Great Britain." Higher up, your correspondent writes: "Ireland . . . . can find no market for her agricultural produce." If this is intended to mean, that at present Ireland has no good paying market for her produce, I can understand it; although a population that has its land for no rent (that it pays,) and that has more money on deposit in the banks, than ever it had before, cannot be very badly off.

I think it is quite too strong to say, that it is an utter and barefaced lie to assert that a mysterious wave of poverty is passing over the whole earth. I do not assent to the assertion; I believe that there is a "wave" of low prices, the cause of which is not at all mysterious, passing over the earth; destined to produce perhaps many political changes, of which the re-enactment of the English corn law will not be one. I do not feel called upon, here, to go over the proofs of the fundamental doctrine of Free Trade, which it is as futile to oppose as the fifth proposition of the first book of Euclid. If the Rev. Mr. Gurney were in parliament, composed as parliament is now, it is possible that he might attain some success in some things that would run counter in their intention to those doctrines; but I think it is more likely that he would be counted out.

B.

March 13, 1886,

---

SIR,—The Rev. Archer Gurney, writing in the PULPIT of the 13th on "The Cause of all our Social Misery," says that "no minister of the Church of God who loves the people can think with patience of the truly monstrous folly" of free trade. When a man publicly avows that he cannot think with patience of the view opposed to his own, he puts himself out of court as a reasoner. But I wish to submit the following to anyone who desires to be reasonable, and may at the same time be inclined to think that there may be something in Mr. Gurney's argument.

How are we to account for the enormous increase in our prosperity, which began with free trade, and lasted for the quarter of a century from 1850 to 1875? During that period we lightened taxation, paid for the Crimean war, and diminished the national debt.

What are we to make of the fact, that since the close of that period, Protectionist America has suffered from depressed trade at least as severely as free-trading England?

How can a country need protection for industry in the home market, which is able to sell a hundred millions' worth of its manufactures in foreign markets, which at the best are neutral, and where in many cases it has to struggle against protective duties?

M.

## THE BLACK RUBRIC AGAIN!

SIR,—I have read "Presbyter's" letter. He has well explained the difference, according to Rome, between the substance and accidents. We in "Kildare" learnt all that in our Divinity school. Of course, transubstantiation does not contradict our senses—because it treats only of what, by our senses, cannot be appreciated—the whole thing rests upon what is not to be proved, viz., that there is such a thing at all as substance independent of all accidents. But the real objection to this theory, that there may be a substance changeable, independent of all accidents, is that it is, on this theory, impossible to be sure that our Lord's Body really rose. That which was tested by the senses of the Apostles, might have been another body, as to substance, though clothed with the look, voice, &c., of our Lord; and might have had the touch of a real body, not being one at all. This is the real objection to transubstantiation; it makes it impossible for us to be sure of His resurrection. Rome laughs at this, because she tells her people to believe the fact of His resurrection merely because she records it. There is nothing new to "Kildare" in your correspondent's letter; but I believe that Roman teaching still maintains the baseless theory, that the substance is changed, though all the accidents remain. I have not seen any book of theirs, either by the Verts like Dalgairns, or by the old Romanists like Wiseman, Di Bruno, &c., who give up the theory, or fail to assert it.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

---

WITHIN a hundred miles of London in a county town, it was considered desirable to drag a canal in search of a missing man. The unemployed were asked to do this. They refused to do so under the wages they had earned, five shillings a day. In a county town, benevolent individuals wished to get up a concert in aid of the unemployed. Men refused to advertise it as "sandwich men," under half-a-crown a day.

ON Thursday last the Rev. George Wyndham Hamilton Knight Bruce, who, since his resignation of the vicarage of St. George, Everton, has been working as an East-end curate, was consecrated at St. Mary's, Whitechapel, to the bishopric of Bloemfontein, in succession to Dr. Webb, transferred to the bishopric of Grahamstown. This is said to be the first occasion on which a Bishop has been consecrated in the East-end of London.

AMONGST other subjects which it is proposed to deal with at the ensuing meetings of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences on April 13, 14, at the National Society's House, Westminster, under the presidency of Mr. H. Cecil Raikes, M.P., are the following:—Church Patronage; Clergy Pensions. Church Councils and Co-operation of the Laity in Spiritual Work; Church Defence; Proposed Legislation on Tithe; Recent Attack on the Church in Wales, &c.

THE Common Serjeant has forwarded to the Bishop of Ely the following address:—"We, the undersigned members of the Southern Committee for the Extension of the Diaconate, desire to congratulate your lordship, as chairman of our first committee meeting, on your elevation to the high office of a Bishop in our Church, and to express an earnest hope that you may be able now to work the more effectually in carrying out this much needed reform." In his note Sir William Charley said, "At the London Diocesan Conference I had the satisfaction of carrying a resolution in favour of

the extension of the diaconate, and the Bishop of London, who was in the chair, expressed his readiness to confer deacon's orders on any gentlemen of leisure and means who are desirous of being admitted to the diaconate without aspiring to priest's orders." Lord Alwyne Compton in reply wrote—"I should not hesitate to do what you say the Bishop of London proposes to do, subject always to satisfactory proofs of the fitness of the candidates for deacon's orders."

TITHES.—Mr. Munby, clerk to the York magistrates, lecturing before the York Church Institute, on Tithes, said :—"It is recorded in a charter of King Ethelwolf 'that if any man shall diminish or commute tithes, let him know that he shall give account of it before the judgment seat of Christ, unless he first repent and make satisfaction.' The moral law of tithes is as ancient and as binding as the keeping holy one day in seven. The sacrifice of Abel had from the earliest times been understood to have been better than that of Cain, because Cain did not rightly 'divide.' The action of Abram and Jacob in this matter was clear and exemplary. King Solomon and the men of his day paid tithes more than threefold. The Scribes and Pharisees were not rebuked by the Messiah for paying tithe, but for neglecting the more weighty matters of the law, while he foretold Christian people that their righteousness must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, who (their faults notwithstanding) were righteous in this particular. In a period of 'bad times' the great Augustine addressed to his Church in Africa these words: 'Our forefathers used to abound in all plenty, for the very reason that they gave their tithes and paid tribute to Cæsar. But now because our devotion to God has departed, the imposition of taxes has increased. We would not give God his share, namely, our tithes, and now the whole is taken from us. The Exchequer takes what Christ does not receive.' By other exhaustive quotations from learned authors (and more particularly the late Dr. Comber), from the Ulster Prize Essays entitled 'Gold and the Gospel,' and other Nonconformist sources, and by reference to many ancient heathen writers, Mr. Munby proved the universal custom of tithes and the truth of the words of Mr. Montague, 'Thus, then, they offered tithes of all to their Gods—to all their Gods—in all the ordinary course of their religion ; and though some have been found who did not sacrifice, none have been found, in all the annals of time, who did not pay tithes.' In conclusion Mr. Munby suggested that alongside the disease may be found the remedy, and that the present 'bitter cry' of increased taxation and local burdens may serve to call attention to a neglect of first principles, the restoration of which might remedy the present distress. On the fore-front of the Royal Exchange, in the heart of London, stand the words, 'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof.' If those words remain, England will continue to assert that ownership before the world. How, then, can Englishmen escape from God's right to exercise that ownership now and in the future, as He has ever done, from the time of Cain and Abel onwards? The words of Malachi, the prophet, no doubt, are stern, but if they apply to our time we may do well to consider whether the challenge conveyed by him is not worthy of our acceptance.

CANON LIDDON, who is still abroad for the benefit of his health, will not be able to preach at St. Paul's next month, but hopes to do so in July. Canon Gregory will take his place in April. Canon Scott-Holland is also away on the continent, and his turn on the Sunday afternoons in May will be taken by Archdeacon Gifford.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adams, Rev. W. J., D.C.L., Rector of All Saints', Dorchester.
Allen, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Long Stanton All Saints, Cambridgeshire.
Ashmall, Rev. F. J., Senior Curate of St. Peter's, Fareham ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Southampton.
Basset, Rev. W., Rector of Frinsley ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Surrey, Mr. G. J. Murray.
Buller, Rev. Frederick George, B.A., Rector of Burrough Green.
Chatto, Rev. James Thomas Chipperfield, M.A., Vicar of Ramsgill.
Clements, Rev. Edward Mansfield, B.A., Rector of Barkston.
Coen, Rev. J. C., Vicar of Cameringham, Lincolnshire.
Cooksey, Rev. John Francis, M.A., Curate of Warboys ; Vicar of Upwood with Great Raveley.
Finch, Rev. William Robert, M.A., Senior Curate of Christ Church, Luton ; Vicar of Rennington-with-Rock.
French, Rev. Robert Digby, M.A., Vicar of Weighton.
Greene, Rev. Carleton, Vicar of Roxton with Great Barford, Beds. ; Rural Dean of Eaton.
Griffiths, Rev. T. D., M.A., Vicar of Maindee, Newport ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff for the County of Monmouth, Mr. Firbank, J.P., of St. Julian's.
Hughes, Rev. Robert Vaughan, M.A., of Wyelands, Chepstow; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Llandaff.
Kitto, Rev. John Fenwick, Rector of St. Dunstan's, Stepney ; Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields.
Lloyd, Rev. Thomas Bucknall, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Shrewsbury ; Archdeacon of Salop.
Mason, Rev. Gerard M., B.A., Curate of Buckland in Dover ; Chaplain and Superintendent of the King Edward's Schools, Witley, Surrey.
Rees, Rev. J., Priest-in-Charge of Helpringham ; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for Deaneries of Lafford.
Rudkin, Rev. Horace, Vicar of Renhold.
Seabrook, Rev. James Herbert, Curate of Atherstone, Warwickshire ; Vicar of Brockworth, near Gloucester.
Vine, Rev. Marshall George, B.A., Incumbent of Micklefield.
Williams, Rev. Arthur Lukyn, M.A., Rector of Ampton.
Witts, Rev. F. E. Broome, Rector of Norton ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Gloucestershire, Mr. A. Sartoris.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bell, Rev. William John, M.A., late Scholar of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, at Chagford, South Devon.
Bruce, Rev. Lloyd Stewart, Prebend of York, Chaplain to the Archbishop of York, and Rector of Stokesley, fourth son of the late Sir J. R. Bruce, Bart., of Downhill, Londonderry, at Bournemouth, on the 19th inst., aged 57.
Bryan, Rev. William Bryan, M.A., Vicar of Haigh and Aspull, and formerly Rector of Rodington, Salop, at Haigh Vicarage, Wigan, on the 20th inst., in his 54th year.
Hockin, Rev. William, M.A., for nearly forty-five years Chaplain of the Devon and Exeter Hospital, at the Chaplaincy, Exeter, on the 22nd inst., aged 87.
Jackson, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's and Rector of Stoke Newington, at the Rectory, Stoke Newington, on the 19th inst., aged 73.
Postlethwaite, Rev. Colin, M.A., late Vicar of Misson, at Arlington House, Retford, on the 14th inst., aged 82.
Roberts, Rev. Arthur, at the Rectory, Barkham, Berks, suddenly, on the 21st inst., aged 72.
Robinson, Rev. Ottywell, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Southwark, and late (for twenty years) Hospitaller of St. Thomas's Hospital, at Portman Street, on the 19th inst., aged 67.
Sewell, Rev. Henry Doyle, M.A., fourth son of the Hon. J. Sewell, LL.D., Chief Justice of Lower Canada, for thirty-six years Vicar of Headcorn, on the 19th inst., aged 79.
Stowell, Rev. Hugh Ashworth, M.A., Rector of Breadsall, near Derby, on the 16th inst., aged 56.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## SALVATION NOT INSTANTANEOUS.

By the Lord Bishop of PETERBOROUGH.

Sermon Preached in Peterborough Cathedral, on Sunday, March 7th, 1886.

"And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."—Matthew xxviii., 18, 19, 20.

THESE words, my brethren, relate for us the founding on earth of the Kingdom of Heaven. They tell us how He, who had all power in heaven and in earth, used that power to create on earth a society, a kingdom which was to last until He should come to earth again. "I am with you alway." In this work of the founding and the spreading of this important and Divine society I am with you always, even until the end of the world. The whole life, the whole history, and the whole character of that Divine Kingdom of Christ, which we call His Church on earth, is summed up in these words. Into that Kingdom, into that Society, into that Church—for these words all mean the same thing—we saw last Sunday that we enter at our baptism. In our baptism you remember we saw we become inheritors of this Kingdom of Heaven, which I showed you means persons who have come into an inheritance—not persons who are heirs of something yet to come. We are heirs of Heaven, but we are inheritors and present possessors of the Kingdom of Heaven which was founded when Christ came, and which exists now; we then, by baptism, are admitted into this Divine Kingdom which Christ founded in these words. Now, I shall have much to say to you yet about the baptism which admits into this Kingdom, and all it represents for us; but I think we shall best understand that if we spend a little time trying to understand the nature of that Divine Kingdom into which Christ admits us at our baptism. Now, in order to do this, let us pause for a moment to think of certain other kingdoms of which we are members not by baptism, but by birth, and by existence in this world. We are every one of us members of the great kingdom of Nature—the vast state which God called into being when He created this universe. We share that kingdom with the animals—the lower animals—for they are members of that kingdom of Nature as truly as we are, and members of that kingdom in a very real sense. Never let us forget it. A Divine Kingdom created by God, and ruled by God, who is the God, King, and Maker of all, but there is another kingdom of which we are members—socially and spiritually—the Kingdom of Humanity, partaking of the nature of God who made it. We hold that between the outside kingdom of Nature and the inner kingdom of Humanity there lies this difference—that God breathed into the nostrils and created man in the image of His maker, and said of that creature what He said of no other, "Let us make man in God's image." The spiritual nature of humanity makes it a kingdom of itself, of which God Himself is King and Lord, a beautiful, divine, and sacred kingdom, God made it, and is the King of it, the King of Humanity, the King of families, and the King of nations. The family is God's creation—woe to him who mars or desecrates that which God has made. The nation is God's creation—woe to the nation that forgets that the Lord God Almighty is the God and King of all nations. A very true and real sacredness have families and nations, seeing that they all come of God. But in this great kingdom of Humanity man is not as the creatures are in Nature, is not obedient to the laws of the kingdom of humanity, but has rebelled against them, has cast away his sonship, and lost the image of God in which he was created, and comes into this world as an outcast from the true Sonship of God, and comes into this world in sin not naturally an obedient creature; and all the suffering, misery and confusion which have been in the history of humanity until now come of man's rejection of the sonship and man's loss of the image of his Creator. God has created another kingdom on earth. That kingdom which we now read of is a Divine Kingdom as the others are, but also a supernatural kingdom, giving back to man the nature of his Father, man being fashioned again in the Divine likeness of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost — giving back to him of the Divine image which he has lost, making him God's son, not merely by creation, but by adoption, and not merely by adoption, but by sanctification giving back to him the image he has lost. It is that supernatural kingdom —this kingdom which God is working in, not by the ordinary laws of nature which are His work, but by the high and greater laws and mightier energies—of which we are inheritors. This Divine Kingdom, which was founded by Christ upon earth—it is this kingdom unto which we are admitted by baptism, the kingdom in which we are Christ's children by adoption and Christ's members by baptism, in which we are likened unto the image of Christ by sanctification of the spirit. This is the object, then, of this

kingdom, and did not God say it to all mankind, "Go ye into all nations," to call out from all mankind, those who were willing to come into this kingdom and be fashioned again in the likeness of their Father in heaven; and therefore our Lord tells us we are baptised into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Now, when we all of us say that we were baptised, and when our Lord says we are baptised in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, it means very much more than that. We acknowledge in our baptism the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and being baptised into the name—which in Scripture language means being baptised into the power of God. The name of God in Scripture signifies the power of God, and so you will find, and it will be a useful exercise for you to see how often and how repeatedly the word "Name" in the Bible signifies the power, the character, and the nature of God; and it is so used in the New Testament. The Apostles, when they wrought one of the miracles, said "In His name," "through faith in His name." Observe, then, that being baptised "in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" means being admitted into the kingdom in which the Divine energies of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost are working together for the redemption and salvation of man; it is being baptised into His nature and receiving His nature upon our souls, which, if we will suffer and not hinder it, will impart the Divine shape, renewing re-moulding, and re-fashioning us again in the Divine likeness which we have lost. That means, of course, always believing in His name. It means as we say in the Creed, "In the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,"—and never let us forget it—it means much more than this. Baptism admits us to a profession of faith, to a power of the Divine life, to the influence of the Divine Spirit upon our spirit. Are we baptised into that name? We are baptised into that name, and that name is our belief. We profess that name in our belief, and we should feel the power of that name, the influence of that Divine energy upon our souls. That is the kingdom into which we were admitted at our baptism. We speak of this Divine Kingdom in our Catechism, and we speak of these Divine, renewing words, with all their re-moulding and sanctifying influences, as a state of salvation. I ask you specially to observe these words. Our Church tells us that the Divine Kingdom into which we are admitted is a state of salvation. Salvation from what? A great many people take it to mean salvation from hell. That is not what the Bible teaches: "Thou shalt call His name Jesus because He shall save His people." From Hell? No. "Because He shall save His people from their sins. Salvation from sin is what Christ has come to work for. Hell is but the outcome of sin; to save men from Hell and not from their sins would be a small mercy. They would make a Hell for themselves. Deliverance from sin, re-fashioning in the image of God, that is the salvation God has come to bring. And then we say His Church is a state of salvation, men being saved from their sins—precious souls in which salvation has begun, and is going on day by day, under those Divine influences and gracious helps which are to be found in the kingdom until at last man becomes perfect in the kingdom he is heir to. Salvation is not an instantaneous process. It is a gradual process, and day after day God's working by the Spirit upon man's soul. The Church is a state of salvation in which a man is being saved. This idea of instantaneous salvation is sadly mistaken and sadly perverted by those who have an idea that Christ came into this world to save man from Hell. Men say that a man is saved from Hell, and he directly works himself into a certain state of feeling and belief, and then is told that he is entitled to say "I am saved!" and they say he is saved, and it is not necessary for him to be baptised and enter into the Kingdom of Christ, but that he is then saved for ever and ever. This was not the idea of Paul. Paul was instantaneously converted, markedly converted, so that he could never forget it, so publicly recording his conversion to Christ; and what did the Teacher tell him? "Arise, and be baptised, and wash away thy sins. Call upon the name of the Lord." You have been converted to Christ; enter, therefore, by baptism, and wash away your sins that you may receive remission and faith from the Lord, and then come on to Salvation, and, as Paul said afterwards to those he was teaching, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," and as he says of himself, "I subdue my body and bring it under;" and taught himself and others to regard themselves as still in a state of salvation from which they might fall away, and still in a condition in which they might work out their own salvation; think it is God who worketh in you to will and to do for his own good purpose. You see, then, that baptism admits us into a state of salvation and brings us into the Divine Kingdom, and because we are His children we might learn of God and say "Abba Father." He brings us into His family by adoption. It gives us by promise and by pledge the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, that Divine presence which has promised to be with us to the end of the world; into that name and power, into that Kingdom, into that family we are admitted by Him who said to His Apostles, "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

---

Mr. Henry A. Cleaver, of St. Asaph, has been appointed Deputy-Registrar of the diocese.

## A DEAN'S FIRST WORDS IN HIS CATHEDRAL.

By the Very Rev. JOHN GOTT, D.D., Dean of Worcester and late Vicar of Leeds.

Sermon Preached in Worcester Cathedral, on Sunday, March 7th, 1886.

"Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee, in whose heart are Thy ways: who going through the vale of misery, use it for a well: and the pools are filled with water. They will go from strength to strength: and unto the God of gods appeareth every one of them in Sion."—Psalm lxxxiv. 5-6.

GOOD people, let my first words to you be a voice of blessing. And you remember that this is one of the Beatitudes of David—of David, not the builder indeed, but the founder, of the cathedral of all cathedrals, the mother-church of Christendom, and the founder also of sacred music, that divine art that lives within the outer art of the architect, the living breath of worshipful voices, that inspires both the cathedral of stone and the cathedral of flesh and blood in the City of God.

"Blessed is the man, whose strength is in Thee, in whose heart are Thy ways: who going through the vale of misery, use it for a well: and the pools are filled with water. They will go from strength to strength: and unto the God of gods appeareth every one of them in Sion."

And is it not well that the first words of your new dean should be given to the regular congregation of the Sunday morning, in the very act of Holy Communion. For these are the true members of the Cathedral, not hearers only, or worshippers alone, but the sons and daughters of the Mother Church.

The Cathedral has indeed a voice for all, and a heart for each, for those who find their natural home in the parish churches of the city, for those who have hindrances or difficulties that dog their way to the church that was specially built and endowed for them, for those who wander in search of some shepherd to feed them in a green pasture and lead them forth beside the waters of comfort.

Aye, and the cathedral has a special place for those also who are wearied, or overworked in that mighty river of life that runs through the heart of Birmingham. Here we have a peace for those tossed in the waves of this troublesome world; here we have a rest for those whose nerves are strained in the high pressure of a famous commerce; here we have comfort for the disappointed in the great competition of our time; here we have hope for those who have lost all lesser hope, and the infinite strength of God which is only made perfect in weakness. Weakness! does any one say that this is not a time for a word so degrading? It rather seems that weakness is only really felt in a period of unusual energy. In other days, when there was little to do, and few to compete with, even feebleness itself seemed strong, for there was no test of its power, or line to fathom its shallowness. But in our age a man's standard must be low, and his aims commonplace, if he is content with his achievement, or satisfied with the power of his brain and the forces of his ability.

For all these, and many more, whose difficulties and temptations and nobler instincts crowd into a preacher's thoughts on a Sunday such as this is to me, the Cathedral of the Diocese has gifts and strength and comfort, that were never wanted so much as at present, to bless the unblessed, whom no man can number, to be the strength of many a life, to show a new and holier way to hearts that have wandered far, to be a well, such as that which the angel showed to Hagar and her boy, which Elisha sweetened to the citizens of Jericho, which David used for a well whose pools were filled with water, which our Lord gave to the woman of Samaria, in which all who will shall pass from strength to strength, and as they pass out of it in death they appear every one of them before the God of gods. Yes, for each of those and for many more, the cathedral may meet a want that no other church in the diocese can satisfy so naturally.

But to its own communicants it is more. To you who have come in and out of these holy gates for many a year, ever finding more and more of unspeakable peace and plenty, nourished on its strength, and rejoicing in its beauty—I only mean the beauty of its holiness—to you my brethren, I want to say my first words, from you let me gather my first sense of the faith and hope and charity which you have long been receiving here; with you I would draw near with faith, and take this Holy Sacrament to our comfort.

For what is the gift of a great cathedral, and where lies its mission to the churches, the factories and the farms of its diocese?

Its gift is holiness, its chief, perhaps its only, gift; and its mission is not so much to convert—for this matter the parish churches are its mission chapels—but to build up with a ripe and perfect faith, to fan with a burning and a shining light, to train to the full stature of Christ the souls who have begun well and yet only half-done.

In its Sunday *evening* service a cathedral may be a cave of Adullam for those who think that no man cares for their soul; it may prick many a conscience, and break down its monotony of a decent and passable religion; it brings many a prodigal to himself; but in its constant communions, and its daily services, in the glory of its worship and the inner life of its devotional addresses, it adds a length and a breadth, a depth and a height to the foundations of the spiritual life, which is the greatest gift of our Lord to His church, and the sorest need of a religious age like our own.

A religious age surely it is. Need our eyes wander further than the walls of a cathedral nobly

restored? If so, let your mind summon before it, the great church extension of England, the crowded Sunday schools, whose children so often eat their breakfast on their road, rather than forfeit the joy and the help of the school, "the noble army" of Church workers, the devoted candidates of our increasing confirmations, and the goodly fellowship of our missionaries abroad.

Probably there was never a time when the minds of the thoughtful and the masses of the people, have sought and found a Father, a Saviour, and a Comforter indeed, so really as England is doing to day.

If this divine appetite is to be fed, it must be nourished on something riper than conversion, and richer than a passable religion.

Probably there was never a time when the spiritual machinery was working among us at higher pressure, or organised in a manner so masterly, and this, too, is worth a special eucharist to our Lord once a year at the least. But to many of us does there not arise at times a great fear lest we wash no more than the *outside* of the cup, and trust over much in that sacred machinery that is growing so perfect, glorying in the means till we lose their end?

It is, I think, a saving fear; but its only antidote is the deepening of the spiritual life, and the fulfilling of the manifold means of grace with the fire that falls from Heaven, the fire that separates good and evil, and purifies all things; the fire that no man can quench.

Cathedrals have done all this in the years of their builders; will they fail us in the day of their re-builders?

I come, as a parish priest, worn in the race of life, hurried along in the manifold cares of a great town, and perhaps over-proud of the energy of a notable centre of trade; I come to seek among you an older energy, and a peace that in itself is a blessing.

One of our chief religious biographers lately complained that the Church of England contributed no clergy whose lives were worthy to be written. The complaint was largely untrue, and a generation which has eagerly fed on the biographies of Arnold and Kingsley and Hook, can hardly complain of all its spiritual leaders; and yet there is surely some ground for the author's complaint, and most of us feel that energy and signal ability are not the whole armour of God, and we seek day and night a more absolute consecration to our Lord, a purer imitation of Christ, a love of souls more fervent and conquering.

We all, clergy and laymen alike, have read of men of like passions as ourselves, who fought a good fight in harder times than ours, to whom to live was Christ and to die was gain, who through faith subdued kingdoms, stopped the mouths of lions, out of weakness were made strong, of whom the world was not worthy, of whom God was not ashamed to be called their God. We know alike by revelation and experience that God is our Father, our Saviour, our Comforter. We certainly believe that we are nothing less than members of Christ, children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of Heaven. And yet do we not often feel that we are only babes in Christ, to be fed not with strong meat, but only with milk and infants' tender food, content with a minimum when a maximum is offered to the least of us, content to be saved when we are "called to be saints," content to be hired servants of our Father when the fatted calf is killed, and the ring and the robe are brought out to us?

But the Cathedrals of England lift up their towers and raise their soaring arches as a great argument against this evil content, and a tonic for an enfeebled spiritual hunger. The Cathedrals of our martyred and saintly fathers talk with those who listen, and help those who earnestly seek them. In holiness to the Lord their first stone was laid, and their highest pinnacle received its crowning touch, the beauty of these walls tells us of the beauty of holiness, and all these fair services have gifts of the higher life for those who feel lonely and poor without them. Every pillar in its strength, and every capital in its beauty, repeats the same inspiration: "Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee, in whose heart are Thy ways. Who going through the vale of misery use it for a well, and the pools are filled with water."

And yet there is daily something here stronger than the pillar, and purer than exquisite carving, for is there not the faith of those who often come here, and are there not the lives of those who are ever seeking more heartily and trusting more fully in those holy walls the Lord and Giver of life!

Our gift—to receive and to hand over to others—our gift is holiness, sanctification to the uttermost. And *our mission* to the parish churches, the factories, and the farms of the diocese, is communion, the only living communion, the communion of saints, and fellowship, the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. It is our special part to "endeavour to keep the *unity* of the Spirit in the bond of peace," for even amid all the churches and sects of Christendom, "there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism." There is a right and wrong, a true and false, in faith and doctrine; all opinions are not equally right or equally wrong, and the truth in creed is as precious as truth in word or truth in business; but together with this standard of revealed truth which we hold up before the world, we believe that there is also "one God and Father of us all, who is above all, and through all, and in all."

Aye, this cathedral is a grand sign of our faith, founded out of the sight of men and in the primitive times, outstanding all revolutions of the world and reformations of the Church, rising above the city and the land with its outline clear across the

heaven for all men to see and to admire, and in its mighty length and breadth large enough to hold all sorts and conditions of men, and blend them into the mighty harmony of divine worship.

Here are no parties, but all are members one of another; all schools of thought find in the cathedral their origin and their perfection; here each sacred opinion and every view of holy things contributes its truth to the common stock of the Family of Christ, and welcomes the divine emotions and the spiritual fact, that our one Father has given to our brothers. Here are no extremes, but the extreme sense of our Lord's Presence, and the bond that weaves into one pattern the woof and the weft that each man brings to the wedding robe of the Church, the Bride of Christ.

To us is given to be the richest in help to all the Churches of the diocese, and to every man and woman and little child whom God has made for His own indwelling. To us is given to be the mother of all, the first to welcome and understand, the last to fail and abandon the immortal souls for whom Christ has died.

---

THE will of Prebendary Humphry, late vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, has been proved, the value of the personal estate amounting to upwards of £45,000.

ON Saturday the 27th ult, at 3 p.m., the Dean of Lincoln held an admission service of members of the Young Women's Help Society in the morning chapel of Lincoln Minster, and delivered an earnest address to the newly admitted members. The Bishop of Lincoln will take the "Three Hours" in his Cathedral on Good Friday, and preach in the evening of Easter Day.

A PARISH council is to be chosen at Easter for St. John's, Waterloo-road. The electors are to be persons of either sex, of eighteen years of age and upwards, who say that they are members of the Church of England and put their names on a register in the vestry. The council will include fifteen elected members, the clergy, churchwardens, and ten sidesmen—thirty in all.

ON Thursday, the 25th ult., the Rev. Dr. F. S. May, for many years connected with Christ Church, Lancaster-gate, and Scandinavian secretary of the Anglo-Continental Society, was invested with the Order of the North Star at the Swedish Legation by his Excellency Count Piper. Among those present at the ceremony were the chaplain of the Legation, seversl English clergy, and members of the Lancaster-gate congregation. Count Piper adverted to Dr. May's labours in promoting intercommunion between the Anglican and Swedish Churches, and to his literary labours in that cause. The King of Sweden, by conferring this distinction, had expressed on behalf of the Church in his dominions the sense entertained by its heads of Dr. May's acquaintance with its history and theology, and of the utility of his visits to the Scandinavian North as an ecclesiastical delegate. Dr. May replied expressing his thanks to the King, and also his obligations to Count Piper for performing the investiture in so public a manner.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 3, 1886.

## CHURCH PATRONAGE.

### IV.—THE BOARD OF PATRONAGE.

SOME of those who defend the present state of Church Patronage, appear to think that the only point to be considered is, what mode of appointment tends to secure the best men? This is, no doubt, the chief point, but it is not the only one. We may see this best by comparison of analogous cases. In the House of Commons it is very doubtful whether the old rotten borough system did not produce a superior body of members to that elected since the first, or any of the later Reform Acts. Yet that system, as is now almost universally admitted, was an evil. It was irrational, unjust, immoral; it degraded the legislature in the estimation both of its own countrymen and of foreigners; and therefore it had to be abolished, as soon as public attention was once thoroughly awakened to its enormities. Once again, the members elected by bribery compare favourably, as to their personal merits, with those elected purely.

The most famous case of electoral bribery ever known was that of the Liverpool contest of 1830 or 1831, between Mr. Denison and Mr. Ewart, in which, on the last day of the poll, votes were sold at £100 and more apiece. Both of these gentlemen were first class candidates; each had, afterwards, a distinguished parliamentary career; and the former became Speaker of the House of Commons. Comparing the members who had been elected by notoriously venal constituencies (Oxford, Chester, Sandwich, &c.), with those who have been the choice of electors who have never been accused of accepting bribes, we find among the former Sir W. V. Harcourt, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Raikes, Mr. Justice Chitty, Mr. Knatchbull Hugessen (Lord Brabourne), all politicians of the first order; and among the latter Dr. Kenealy, Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. H. Labouchere, Mr. Biggar, Mr. O'Donovan Rossa, and Mr. Michael Davitt. Should we venture to say, in this case, that bribery works well, seeing that it secures the election of wealthy men, men of position, men with a stake in the country, men who have something to lose, while pure elections often result in the success of

a mere carpet-bagger? We see without difficulty that, irrespective of the results obtained or the men elected, the act of buying votes must be judged on its own merits; and that it is immoral in itself, and degrades the legislature which comes into being through such means. Similarly, in the case of appointment to Church offices, we have to consider, not only what mode of election secures the best men; but also which is morally right in itself; and which is most fitted to attract public respect and confidence to the persons who may be appointed. We have already dismissed Private Patronage, on the ground that, although not in itself morally wrong, it is attended by a necessary incident—purchase and sale—which is flagrantly immoral. We now proceed to consider the constitution of those Boards of Patronage, which will have to take its place.

These Boards must, if possible, be so constituted as to possess the confidence both of the laity and of the clergy. The laity must feel that they or their representatives have, as in ancient days (Acts i. 23, vi. 3), a determining voice in the appointment of the officials of the Church. The clergy must have reason to know that a free career is opened to them in Church employments; in which it is their interest as well as their duty, not to court patrons, but to do their work as well as it can be done, so as to win the confidence of the people.

It is very difficult to introduce the lay voice, without giving rise to the evils which necessarily beset popular elections—canvassings, stump-oratory, caucuses, wire-pullers—even bribes. Direct election is not to be thought of. Only indirect is possible, by means of nominators, who, although chosen by the people, must not be chosen with a view to a particular election, but must be standing officials of the Church, ready to act whenever their services are required.

The only such board actually in operation, that we know of, is that adopted by the Church of Ireland, of which we borrow the following description from a paper by Canon Courtenay Moore, published in our own columns.

In each parish there are three Parochial Nominators, laymen, who, with the Bishop of the Diocese and two clergymen and one layman on behalf of the diocese, form a Board of Nomination. When a parish becomes vacant, the Bishop, who is chairman, summons the Board of Nomination, which consists, as we have now seen, of seven persons, and they elect a clergyman. If the parochial element of the Board be unanimous, they generally succeed in electing the clergyman of their choice. Objections have been made to this system of nomination, but on the whole it does not work at all badly. The parochial element is the strongest, if unanimous; but this was intended, as the parish has to produce the principal part of the salary of the clergyman. It is said, indeeed, that, in general, parochial nominators know only very few of the clergy of a diocese, viz., those in their own neighbourhood, and this is quite true. There may be other clergy in the diocese unknown to them, much better suited for the post. Here, however, the bishop and diocesan nominators can act, and suggest the names of more suitable candidates if necessary, their larger knowledge of the diocese coming into play. Parochial nominators, however, do not always accept such suggestions, and they are also very little inclined to consider length of service as a qualification; they only consider what pleases themselves, and while a Bishop would naturally take into account a clerk's standing in the diocese, and his learning, these claims would probably tell little with many Parochial Nominators, if weighed in the balance, say, with a power of popular preaching.

The above information is extremely valuable as being not theory, but actual experience. Let us now compare with these Irish Boards the Board of Patronage proposed in the Draft Bill of the Primate, which was discussed by the Convocations and by the House of Laymen.

There shall be a Board of Patronage in each diocese, consisting of the Bishop (who shall be chairman), one representative of the Greater Chapter of the diocese (to be chosen in the manner prescribed in the Pluralities' Acts Amendment Act), one representative of the clergy of each archdeaconry in the diocese (to be chosen under the said Act), one layman to be nominated by the Chancellor of the diocese, one layman to be nominated by the Lord-Lieutenant of the county or counties forming the diocese, and one layman to be nominated by the chairman or chairmen of Quarter Sessions of the same county or counties. All such persons nominating to be Churchmen, and all such laymen nominated to be Churchmen and resident in the diocese, and such representative members of the board to be in office for three years. In any diocese in which there are more than two archdeaconries arrangements shall be made for the combination of two archdeaconries (or parts of two archdeaconries) in the election of one representative. In case of the vacancy of any living in the gift of the board the Archdeacon of the archdeaconry in which the benefice is situate and one of the churchwardens (being a Churchman) of the parish concerned, selected by the churchwardens, shall be members of the board *pro hâc vice*.

Let us place these two Boards side by side, for the sake of comparison.

| The Irish. | The Proposed English. |
|---|---|
| 1. The Bishop. | 1. The Bishop. |
| 2, 3. Two Diocesan Clergymen. | 2. The Archdeacon. |
| 4, 5, 6. Three parochial Laymen. | 3. Representative of the Greater Chapter. |
| 7. One Diocesan Layman. | 4, 5. Two Representatives of Archdeaconries. |
| | 6. One Lay Nominee of Chancellor. |
| | 7. One Lay Nominee of Lord-Lieutenant. |
| | 8. One Lay Nominee of Chairman of Quarter Sessions. |
| | 9. One Churchwarden. |

Our readers may now observe the contrast between these two Boards. In the Irish, the majority is lay (4 to 3), in that of Archbishop Benson, the majority is clerical (5 to 4). In the Irish, the parochial element is very strong (3 out of 7), only one short of a majority; in the Archbishop's, that element is reduced to a minimum (1 in 9). Further, in the Primate's Board, the elective element is very weak (3), and the nominee portion is very strong (6); and this both in the clerical and in the lay departments. The result of the adoption of the English Board would be to clericalise the lay Patronage, and to reduce it into the power of

the bishop, as our astute Primate no doubt foresaw. We give our voice most decidedly in favour of a Board of the same type as that of the Church of Ireland, in which all the nominators have been chosen by free election, and in which the majority is *Lay*.

We will conclude by impressing on our readers the importance of establishing these Boards, and carefully regulating their constitution. When once established, as we have recommended, with a working lay majority, they will soon win the confidence of the parishioners and of the laity of the Church, and will gradually, and rapidly, draw all other patronage into their hands. When the parishioners of parish A. have an assured voice in the choice of their own minister, is it likely that the adjoining parish B. will submit to have its vicar or rector appointed in the Auction Mart, or even sent to take command of its souls at the dictation of the Bishop? When these Boards have been established on the somewhat democratic basis which is now the only possible one, not only the present private patronage, but also that which is now public, must go into their hands. Then, no doubt, a fresh set of imperfections will arise, incidental to democracy; but we shall have seen the last of episcopal nepotism, favouritism, and despotism.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### PROTECTION TO NATIVE INDUSTRY.

SIR,—The space allotted in your columns to economical questions is necessarily too limited to admit of full and comprehensive treatment. I desired to say that, in common with most modern political economists in all countries save Britain, and in common with all the ruling states of the world, I believed the principle of unrestricted competition or free trade be to the worst of all economical error and confusion. My contention is, broadly (and this is the principle acted on by the United States of America, our own colonies, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Russia, and every civilised government in the world), that it is the first and primary duty of every State to secure the interests of labour, and promote production by endeavouring to secure a reasonable profit to the producer. All cheapness obtained at the cost of the native producer is a dead loss to any country or community.

I repeat that food and clothing are the two chief requisites of mankind, and that no country can allow itself to be dependent on another for the essentials of food and clothing, which it can produce at home. The primary law of God and nature is that man should earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, *i.e.*, exertion, intellectual or manual; as the first condition of the acquisition of every good. In other words production precedes consumption, and therefore the producer's interest is always paramount. A country's wealth depends primarily and mainly on the extent of its productive power, on the skill and energy of its population and the powers of its soil.

Of all forms of production, agriculture is the first and chiefest; first, because food is the first essential of human life, and its existence should not be dependent on foreign supplies, which a great war may at any time cut off; secondly, because agriculture is the most healthful of all occupations, the most conducive under due conditions to health of body, and length of life; thirdly, because it is the most permanent of all employments necessarily identified with the interests of the most influential and highly educated classes of the land, the peers, the landed gentry, the representatives of hereditary power and virtue, deprived of whom a State becomes a mere congeries of units, like modern France, at the mercy of chance or of any successful soldier or party that gains possession of the helm.

Now it is absolutely certain that no old country can compete with the world in agricultural produce. Therefore, without protection the old country must cease to be tilled under the influence of unrestricted competition.

But this is not all. Unrestricted competiton means the senseless war of plough with plough, shuttle with shuttle, loom with loom, labour with labour, to see which population can be made to work the hardest for the least pay, so as to undersell the rest, and this for the supposed benefit of that abstraction, "the consumer." It is admitted that ninety-nine men out of every hundred can only be consumers on the condition of being producers first. Take the hundredth, the stockholder, who seems to have an immediate interest in low prices. He cannot long continue to thrive by the misery and ruin of his fellow citizens. The value of his stock decreases, for money commands less and less interest under the reign of unrestricted competition and no profits. Finally national bankruptcy must supervene and swallow all.

As a simple matter of fact we have only paid our way for the last twenty years by giving our coal and iron, our hoarded capital, in exchange for the annual produce of the soil on other lands, and spending at the present rate our coal or hoarded capital will barely last a century. So says that noted free trader, the Duke of Argyll, and the fact admits, I believe, of no dispute.

Adam Smith wrote before steam power was dreamt of. He thought naturally and reasonably that the protection of transport dues would suffice to secure a fair profit for native agricultural produce, and even for nearly twenty years together; it did so after the abolition of the corn laws, and wheat was sold for 60s. a quarter. It is now sold for 30s., and will be soon for 25s. Millions of acres have gone out of cultivation, and a million and a-half of agricultural workmen have been driven into the towns or to the workhouses.

Absolute agricultural ruin stares us in the face. All but our very best lands will cease to be cultivated at all. The beginning of the end is at hand. And in the face of the fact that the whole civilised world out of Britain condemns unrestricted competition with scorn and contempt, and protects the interests of labour and home capital as the first of all economical duties, your correspondents can talk of "the fundamental doctrine of free trade," regarded as an exploded fallacy by every thinker and every statesman in the wide world out of Britain. It is not true that any wave of low prices is passing over America or Australia. France suffers from her peasant-culture,

because no capital is brought to bear on the soil, and a bad harvest means immediate ruin to her cultivators. But the first principle recognised now by all genuine political economists and statesmen is that production must precede consumption, that the wealth of a country depends on the amount of its productive powers, and that therefore the producer's interest must be paramount.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
March 27, 1886.

## FREE TRADE.

SIR,—In matters theological I do not find myself able to agree with Mr. Gurney. In this matter of Free Trade—a name, but no fact—I am in just accord with him.

I can understand his warmth and think there is only too much reason for it.

Your readers seem to forget that causes, other than free trade, have been in operation. The reasoning takes this shape. Trade has been better since the adoption of Free Trade principles, therefore those principles are sound. The reasoning is just about as good as to say, I was born since the Queen, therefore she is my mother. The truth is that trade increased in spite of and not in consequence of Free Trade. There are plenty of facts to prove this. Otherwise, why is trade so bad now?

Now we may be sure that we have not all the wit and wisdom in the world. Other people, too, have some common sense, but they do not act as we do. There is no nation under the sun that does anything but profit from, rather than by, our example. This is very suggestive.

This seems to be Prince Bismarck's mode of reasoning. It is quite clear if manufactured goods are brought into this country, then our people have not to make them. It is also as clear that if corn is brought into this country then our people have not to grow it. Two evils come of this. Labour is not wanted. Capital goes out of the country. These evils must be counterbalanced. Therefore, tax, tax, tax. The result is prosperity and comfort. Let wise men judge whether this policy is sound or not.

The fear is that we are suffering from two causes. (1.) A blind adherence to theories in spite of the mighty opposition of facts. (2.) An unwillingness to confess that we are or can be wrong.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, March 27th, 1886.

## PATRIOTISM.

SIR,—Surely the time has come for every one to ask, "Shall we do nothing to express publicly our patriotism, and opposition to the premier's plans, more than surmised'? I have spoken to-day to several laymen, Conservatives and Liberals, and we are of one mind, that a public meeting should be held, embracing all sorts and conditions of men and opinion, to protest against any measures which tend to disintegrate our United Kingdom, and give Home Rule to Ireland, of such a kind as the Irish members desire. If Mr. Gladstone's scheme passes through the House of Commons, then the Lords are held up to odium for rejecting it summarily. The next step is a general election, when the real issues would be clouded by Mr. Gladstone and his friends, while popular feelings were excited most unwarrantably against the House of Lords. I hope the public who have any patriotism, will bestir themselves and by public meetings all over England, Wales, and Scotland, protest against national suicide.

P.

March 22, 1886.

## THE BLACK RUBRIC IN THE *CHURCH TIMES*.

SIR,—A writer in your contemporary of this week has a bright idea. He says that the Rubric need cause no difficulty, "if we regard it as defining the relation between Christ's glorified body in heaven and the sacred elements to be precisely the same as between them and His body on earth, when at the institution of the last supper." Of course the relation he speaks of, is exactly the same; but the rubric defines nothing of the kind! All it says is that Christ's natural body, that is, His body, as it exists in heaven now, cannot be in two places at once, and that no adoration ought to be paid to any corporal presence of this His natural body on the altar. The only presence which the Rubric allows, is that stated by Bull, Jackson, Cosin, &c., as that of the sun, present in a room or garden, to enlighten and warm. It is vain to say that our Lord's body is now a spiritual body, and not a natural body. Whatever difference there can be imagined between the two, the Savoy divines were well aware of. If they knew that no natural body of His now exists, why should they pronounce about it? What they meant to decide about, was His body, now existent. They call it His natural body, and say that it is locally present in heaven, and nowhere else; and that it is not to be adored on the altar, as if present. A man cannot get rid of this Rubric by saying that it defines what it does not touch on at all.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

## CONTROVERSIAL CANDOUR.

SIR,—Your valuable correspondent, "Presbyter," possesses the above rare gift. It is pleasant to read his clear, calm, and candid letters. His view of the Roman dogma of transubstantiation is that taken by such eminent writers as Thirlwall and Stanley, and is familiar to any candid reader of the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Uncandid controversy is eventually most injurious; it may snatch a momentary triumph, but when it is seen through it has a necessary tendency to disgust the detector with all controversy. I know some anti-Roman controversialists who would almost drive me over to Rome in a month were I obliged to listen to them so long.

Allow me to observe, with reference to another letter in your last issue, that it is very incorrect to say that the Irish laity invented a constitution for the Irish Church. The General Synod is composed of Bishops, clergy, and laity; the laity alone can carry nothing. It is too late to sneer at the laity, when it is one of the pressing problems in England to admit them to their just place—Church Councils. It is

about equally incorrect to say that Church Patronage in Ireland has been virtually thrown into the hands of "farmers."

Irish Boards of Nomination consist of the Bishop of the diocese, two clerical diocesan nominators, one lay ditto, and three parochial nominators. The Bishops and clergy are not "farmers," nor are the parochial nominators always farmers.

The Irish nobility and judges supply parochial nominators from their numbers, and leading country gentlemen frequently act. With regard to the scurrilous extract from the *Church Times* about the quality of the Irish clergy, it is one of the many instances in which that violent organ has not kept its "tongue from evil speaking, lying, and slandering."

AN IRISHMAN NOT ASHAMED OF HIS CHURCH OR HIS COUNTRY.

P.S.—The enclosed cutting from the *Daily Express* of Saturday last is an apt illustration and proof of my statement:—

Enniskillen, Friday.

The Rev. Mr. Ovenden, Incumbent of Portrush, and Succentor of St. Patrick's, Dublin, was to-day elected Rector of Enniskillen, at an adjourned meeting of the Board of Nomination, which consisted of Lord Belmore, Lord Enniskillen, the Dean of Clogher, Rev. J. B. Frith, J.P., and Dr. Walsh, J.P. The vacancy was created by the death of the Rev. Samuel Greer, who held the Rectorship for close on half a century.

Your Armagh "Subscriber" thinks I know very little about Ireland, but having lived seventeen years in Ulster, eight in Leinster, and twenty in Munster, I beg to differ from him.

## Reviews and Notices.

"ST. PAUL, THE AUTHOR OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND OF THE THIRD GOSPEL. By the Rev. H. Heber Evans, Vicar of Mapperley, and formerly Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo., pp. 210. London: Wyman & Sons.

THE handy volumes which bear the above rather startling title contain an attempt to prove, on internal evidence, that the Apostle of the Gentiles wrote the two books of the New Testament, which tradition has assigned to Luke. The reason of the endeavour is stated with considerable candour. A solid standpoint is needed against the scepto-critical school of Baur, Renan and Zeller, and the author ingenuously acknowledges that he adduces his proofs of Pauline authorship to gain that standpoint, and to overthrow their position. We have no doubt that his opponents will give his motive its full weight. Nor do we object to his catching the infidels on the hip, only, unfortunately, in wrestling well with them, he, like another Orlando, overthrows more than his enemies. If Mr. Heber Evans makes good his point, the slaughter of the innocents must follow. The noble army of orthodox commentators, in lawn and out of it, will indeed become an army of martyrs. All biblical works, at least on the New Testament, will have to be re-written; copies of Scripture will want renaming; Scripture exegesis recasting; and works after the fashion of Paley's "Undesigned Coincidences," consigned to the waste paper basket. Has Mr. Heber Evans evaluated the weight of the mere *vis inertiæ* against his view? What he aims at is little short of a revolution. For ourselves we take a grain of comfort in the fact that the proposed substitution of Paul for Luke, as an author, is not a new one. We hasten to inform the readers of THE PULPIT that an anonymous Saxon author published a learned work at Leipzic, in 1845, advocating the same view. We have an idea that he retracted his revolutionary position afterwards. In any case the sun of Biblical criticism still continued to rise in the East and set in the usual quarter after this portentous apparition, and it will probably continue to do so now that Mr. Heber Evans's book has appeared.

But if we demur to the main conclusion, the author must not suppose that it is from want of sympathy with his object, or that we do not travel part of the way at least with him. We candidly allow that the traditionary authorship of the third Gospel and Book of Acts is not so definite, nor so early, as we should desire. We agree that these two works proceed from the same pen, and. though Origen states that they were written by a Gentile for Gentiles, we cannot overlook the fact that there are Hebraisms in all the chapters of both books, least of all in Acts xiii., xiv., xvii., xxiii., and xxiv. One chapter alone is an exception to this general statement, viz., chapter xxv., which contains no Hebraisms. (See Guillemard's Greek Test., Hebraistic ed.) The Book of Acts was less known than the Gospel, and, so late as the ninth century, Photius (Quest. 145) writes: "Some say that Clement of Rome was the author of the Acts, others Barnabas, and others Luke the Evangelist." We may add, however, that where Paul was supposed to be the author of the third gospel, there existed the uncritical belief that when Paul said, "My gospel" (Rom. ii. 16, Tim.), he meant that now called Luke's.

But if tradition is unsatisfactory, so also is the argument of Lucan authorship of the Acts, based on the "we" sections. Though repeated complacently by many commentators, we must in fairness acknowledge that their argument is weak. That Paul kept notes of his journeys and missionary work, in order to give an account to the Church at Antioch, or to refresh his own memory, is probable enough; that they were not absolutely in his own handwriting is pretty certain, from the analogy of his Epistles, but that they were all by Luke, and that Paul should never mention him once in those epistles which he wrote during his travels is surprising. If Luke resided seven years at Philippi (Farrar), how is it that Paul never mentions him in writing to the Philippians, whether from Rome or elsewhere? Nothing that happens in the course of the narrative of the Acts, peril, persecution, popular tumult, arrest, plot, imprisonment, shipwreck, medical need, arrival at Rome, nothing conjures Luke into the smallest instance of active individuality. We do not wonder therefore that acute critics, like Schleiermacher, De Wette and Bleek should read some more active agent than Luke in the "we" sections, and we sympathise with Mr. Heber Evans' dissatisfaction.

We further agree with him where he criticises Dr. Hobart's "Medical Language of St. Luke." No better thumbed book lies before us, as we write, than this one. Were this the place we could say much about it. Suffice it for the present to say that if Mr. Heber Evans had added the names of Josephus and Philo to the LXX., as exhibiting the language of non-medical writers, he would have strengthened greatly his adverse criticism. We are puzzled, however, by the appearance of the verb *ἐνδυναμοῦν*, "to strengthen," in the chapter on Dr. Hobart's book, seeing that it is not one of the words which he alleges in his list, as proof of Luke's medical phraseology, and we are sur-

prised to find Mr. Heber Evans assert that ἐνδυναμοῦν "is to be found in no Greek author whatever *out of the Septuagint*." We will refresh his memory with two instances at least. Clement ad Cor. 55, πολλαὶ γυναῖκες ἐνδυναμωθεῖσαι διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐτελέσαντο πολλὰ ἀνδρεῖα. Again, Act. Thom. § 10, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐνδυναμῶν τὰς ψυχάς. Then again, in this same chapter, Mr. Heber Evans makes the astounding assertion, "To a Gentile Moses was of no more authority than Confucius is to a Christian." If, by "Gentile," he means a convert to Christianity of Greek origin, and that is the point of his argument, and if, by "Christian," he means a modern believer, we differ from him *toto cœlo*. The early Patristic writings are full of quotations from the Old Testament, not from the Psalms and Prophets to the exclusion of the Books of Moses, but indiscriminately. Clement of Rome was, as his name implies, a Latin, yet he speaks of the Old Testament Scriptures as "the true oracles of the Holy Ghost." (Clem. ad Cor. 45.) Again, just before quoting at length from Deuteronomy and Exodus, he calls the attention of his readers to "the sacred Scriptures, as τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ (ad Cor. 53.) Clement further speaks of Jacob as ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, "our father Jacob." The Epistle of Barnabas is fuller still of quotations from, and references to the Books of Moses, and, although not himself a Gentile, if the Epistle be genuine, still, as he wrote for Greek readers, his scriptural authorities would be theirs also. Paul enjoined the reading of the Old Testament to Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 13), and, if to him, then also to the Church at Ephesus. A few heretics apart, no one in the Christian Church doubted the divine origin of the Old Testament; it was constantly cited dogmatically; in the second century, at latest, it was publicly read in Christian assemblies, and it was only in course of time that the books of the New Testament were raised to the same standard of authority. Is it credible that Moses should have been regarded in the dim light of indifference, which Mr. Heber Evans asserts, when our Lord quoted from his books for His authority, kept the Passover which Moses had instituted, and, after His resurrection, *began at Moses* to expound in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself (Luke xxiv. 27, 44)? We think not. While on the authority of the Old Testament, we notice Mr. Heber Evans's remarks on Luke xi. 49, and his explanation (Letter iii., p. 29). In this text, what should be a quotation from the Old Testament, possibly from 2 Chron. xxiv. 18-22, is introduced by the unusual words, ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶπεν, "The wisdom of God said." In several books of the Old Testament, particularly in the Wisdom of Sirach, which anticipates many New Testament expressions, we have abundant praise of σοφία, "wisdom," as the instructor of all good knowledge (vii. 22); the spirit of wisdom to which God bears witness (i. 6); the σοφία τοῦ κυρίου (xv. 18), and πνεῦμα κυρίου (i. 7). "The Word of God is the fountain of wisdom" (i. 5) says Sirach. Remembering that these expressions are culled out of many such, we understand by, "The wisdom of God saith," God in His wisdom saith. Moreover, it so happens that in one of the sub-apostolic fathers, Clement of Rome, almost the same expression occurs. Introducing a quotation from the Book of Proverbs, he says, οὕτως γὰρ λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία, "Thus saith the ineffable wisdom," (Clem. ad. Cor. 57), where the word "of God" is of course, understood. Such a view obviates the wrenching σοφία away from γνῶσις, as Mr. Heber Evans does to establish a parallel to Romans xi. 33, and it assigns such a form of quotation as that of Luke xi. 49 to its older and more obvious source.

We readily agree with the author on another point. The verbal likeness to Paul's known phraseology is undoubted. It is apparent in the Acts more than in the third Gospel, and, most of all, in the speeches recorded as Paul's. This point Mr. Heber Evans has made clear, in his Additions to Appendix A., No. iv., although it is neither alphabetically arranged nor does it follow the order of Acts. The Appendices generally are made repulsive to students by utter want of order. Here is room for re-arrangement and correction. The fact remains of strong verbal similarity between Paul and Luke. That a number of words and expressions noted are also found in the early Patristic writings does not detract from the fact. In addition, their cumulative evidence is great. So great that we expect the author has been led away by it to force the point of authorship. But we must not overlook the fact, that while the Book of Acts has Pauline words and phraseology, it has another feature of interest which negatives to some extent the alleged authorship of Paul. It presents in a lesser degree Petrine similarities. In the speeches attributed to Peter, we meet with such Petrine words as καρδιογνώστης, ξύλον (cross), παῖς (for Jesus), λαγχάνειν, προσόγνωσις, and ἀθέμιτος, which individualise the older disciple. The fact has already been noticed by critics. Clearly if Paul—supposing him for one moment the author of Acts—could adopt Petrine phraseology in a work generally speaking on Pauline lines, a third party, say Luke, could equally well adopt the verbal peculiarities of both in his own work. Mr. Heber Evans is surely aware that Pauline and Petrine phraseology occur still more abundantly in the works of Clement of Rome, Ignatius and Polycarp. We have scores of words and several phrases before us, which we could quote to the point. But Mr. Heber Evans takes no notice of this important fact. He is fond of parallels. Let him strike out of his work the parallel of Paul to Ezra, which is superficial and beside the mark, and draw a phraseological parallel between Luke, as the author of the Acts, and Clement of Rome, the author of the Epistle to the Corinthians which bears his name. He will find, I think, that both these disciples of Paul belonged to that school of religious thought and expression which that great master had founded, and that they both, in a spirit of conciliation, unite Peter with Paul in the great work of founding the Christian Church. The minds of the two apostles pervade both works and about in the same degree.

We pass on to our objections to the alleged authorship of Paul. In his first Epistle to the Corinthians (xv. 1—8), Paul lays due stress on the witness to the resurrection of our Lord. He claims that he received the testimony and that he delivered it to his converts. Now part of it was (v. 6) that Christ was seen of above five hundred brethren at once, and after that of James. Neither of these important visions of our Lord appear in the Gospel of Luke. To us it appears impossible that he could have omitted them. In a lesser degree it appears unaccountable that Paul in the Acts should say nothing about his journey into Arabia immediately after his conversion (Gal. i. 17), or, if words are the test of authorship, that in Acts ix. 25, the word σπυρίς should be used for the basket, in which Paul was let down from the wall of Damascus, while in 2 Cor. xi. 33

the word is σαργάνη, with a different meaning. The introduction to the third Gospel, if from the pen of Paul, should claim apostolic authority, which it does not. Other discrepancies might easily be adduced. Three points suggest themselves to which only one answer can be given. We note that once in the New Testament Paul is spoken of as the writer of Epistles (2 Pet. iii. 16), but no mention of his alleged authorship of a Gospel and Acts. This testimony is endorsed by Ignatius, in his genuine epistle to the Ephesians, § 12, where speaking of Paul he says "who in every epistle makes mention of you in Jesus Christ" Polycarp (ad Philip. 3), speaking of the blessed and glorified Paul, says, "He taught the word of truth with accuracy and certainty, and, being absent, wrote you epistles." No mention here or elsewhere in the sub-apostolic Fathers of Paul's authorship of a Gospel and Acts, while his epistles are thus early recognised. This is a point which Mr. Heber Evans ignores.

We pass to our second consideration. Paul and John were confessedly the two men of genius in divinity in the early Christian Church. They, in different directions, gave Christianity an impress and stamp which it bears at the present day. They gathered round them disciples whose thought and expressions were moulded by their master minds. The language of a leader of thought like Paul, disciples could readily adopt, but not the mind of the master underlying his words. To ourselves the psychological difference between Paul and Luke is a great gulf fixed. No verbal parallelisms can bridge it over. The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hand is the hand of Esau. So much so, indeed, that the distinctive principles of Paul which shine forth most of all in his Epistle to the Romans, his Eirenicon to Jewish antagonists, have no place in the Book of Acts, or, if they have (Acts xiii. 38, 39), it is in a feeble and half-hearted way, "with bated breath and whispering humbleness," and utterly unlike the bold language and definite position of the great apostle of the Gentiles. Any pupil could take up the chisel of Phidias, the brush of Raphael, or the mantle of Elijah, but he could not reproduce the glowing soul of the immortal master. Similarities of language, like mannerisms in painting and music, must not delude us. Paul's verbal peculiarities are not Paul. Language, like fire, is a good servant but a bad master. Mr. Heber Evans misses here the substance for the shadow.

Our last consideration is the high improbability that, if Paul had written the third Gospel and Acts the authorship should have been traditionally ascribed to Luke. Such an ascription would be reversing the whole tendency of Jewish and early Christian literature. We need not take up Köstlin's "Dissertation" to be assured that pseudonymous literature was abundant enough, well known names being conveniently used as vehicles of thought by unknown authors. This characteristic feature is intelligible enough. Mr. Heber Evans would have us believe that, in this particular case, the reverse process took place, and that the well known Apostle of the Gentiles is defrauded of his genuine works. Tradition is thus made to take the ascription of authorship from a central figure of Christianity and to assign it to a comparatively unknown unit in the Christian community. For such an assertion there is no analogy. None is adduced. Should Mr. Heber Evans issue a second edition of his work we would suggest a serious consideration of these difficulties, in addition to re-arrangement and classification of his matter. For want of the leading word and alphabetical arrangement, (Part 2, pp. 150—155,) the great majority of his readers will assuredly skip those pages altogether, and the author's industry be thrown away.

---

"EXPOSITIONS." By the Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D. Second Series. London: T. Fisher Unwin. Pp. 455.

WE hope that when a third series of Dr. Cox's Expositions is published—and we shall gladly welcome a third and yet a fourth series—that the size and shape of the book will be altered. A volume of sermons is not a learned treatise to be read at a desk, but a book to be read very often at night, and to be held in the hand, which the book now before us certainly cannot be with comfort. The printing is excellent, but we do ask that the next volume may be smaller in size.

It is hardly necessary to speak words of commendation of the contents of the book, we have praised the author's sermons before, and gladly do so again. They are decidedly interesting sermons, when you have read one you want to read another. Moreover, they often throw a great deal of light on uncertain, or difficult, or misunderstood passages, although Dr. Cox does not invent difficulties for the purpose of explaining them as some subtle-witted preachers do.

And yet we have an objection to make which we do not want to make, but which we must make, necessity is laid upon us that we make it. Sir Henry Taylor, in his "Autobiography," said that the principal use of sermons now-a-days was to make respectable people uncomfortable; now, no one will be made uncomfortable by these sermons, *not even the sinner*. Dr. Cox is filled so full of "the larger hope" that he can see nothing else hardly; his certainty of the ultimate victory over sin has almost blinded him to present sin. We are not concerned to dispute the doctrine of the "larger hope," far from it, but we do say, most emphatically, that, unless very carefully handled, it is an exceedingly dangerous doctrine. Dangerous because we must face facts. Men are what they are, exceedingly liable to cry peace when there is no peace, exceedingly blind to the foulness and degradation of sin, exceedingly willing to be saved, but exceedingly unwilling to work out their own salvation. Those who must preach the doctrine of the "larger hope"—the present writer has never once preached it and never will, he thinks, although he holds it—should preach it as Archdeacon Farrar does, coupled, that is, with the sternest, strongest, and extremest denunciation of sin. Congregations, especially of the eminently respectable class, are far too ready to trust in things coming round, and need plain speaking far more than pleasant speaking. Moreover, Christianity is anything but pleasant speaking; sleek respectability does not realize our Saviour's parable of Dives and Lazarus—Dives was thoroughly respectable—nor think over the meaning of His words "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of Heaven." Like the modern voter who would like three acres and a cow without working for them, the modern Christian would very much like the Crown of Glory hereafter without the Cross of self-sacrifice here, which thing cannot be; but this volume of sermons might, quite unintentionally, lead him to think that it can. For let us be understood, we are quite aware that Dr. Cox thinks no such thing, and

we shall be ready to answer any slanderer who falsely accuses him; but we do ask that in the third series of the "Expositions" there be sermons, sufficient in proportion, setting forth in very plain spoken language what sin is, what its inevitable consequences are, and what its punishment must necessarily be.

"GOOD AND EVIL IN THEIR RELATION TO THE DISPENSATIONS OF PROVIDENCE." By George Wall, F.L.S., F.R.A.S. London: Frederick Norgate. 1886. Pp. 64.

THIS is a most valuable and interesting little work. The writer, as he states in his preface, "believes that the ills of life are essential factors in this probationary state, and that we are made perfect, as was the Captain of our salvation, through suffering, and that they ought to be cheerfully endured for the sake of the incomparably greater weight of glory to be wrought out through their agency." He proves his creed in a satisfactory manner by pointing out that the "evils" in the moral, like those in the physical world, are productive of eventual good, and demonstrate the goodness of God, by exposing the fallacy of the popular belief that "the Fall" was the cause of all the evil in the world, and by demonstrating that Heaven is not merely a restoration of Paradise. The author's style is perhaps too concise and abstract for a general and ordinary reader to fully grasp the whole of his argument, but a useful syllabus of the reasonings, at the beginning of the work, will be of great assistance. It is a work to be read, re-read, and pondered over, by all our religious instructors. The author possesses the indispensable qualification for guiding us to a right decision on this most important subject; for he seems to be as well versed in God's Book of Nature, as in that of Revelation. His general views of the universe in relation to Good and Evil are admirable, and will well repay the most careful study.

ON Saturday, the 27th ult., at a breakfast given at the Grosvenor Gallery Restaurant by the National Church Reform Union, Mr. Albert Grey, M.P., said that the question of Disestablishment, which had been ruled out of court at the last election, might become a burning question at the next. Whether it would or not depended in great measure upon them. It was for those who believed in the national principle, who believed that a national establishment supported and controlled by the people, either contributed a help to the religious life of the community which would not be forthcoming if the Church were disestablished, or was capable of being made such a contributing force by the passing of judicious reforms—it was for those who held that belief to convince the public mind how injurious would be the policy of disestablishment, and how full of hope and benefit was the policy of reform. The only method of interesting the people in the Church was by giving them some control over their own Church affairs. The present aristocratic government of the Church had failed; that must be recognised. Its recognition lay at the bottom of the almost universal desire to admit the laity into the local government of the Church. The efforts of the Church Reform Union were concentrated upon an endeavour to make the Church popular in its constitution. They accepted the existing limits which regulated doctrine, but maintained that as within the limits laid down by law there was room for much variety in the form and manner of celebrating the services; the power of deciding what particular form of service should be followed within the parish church should rest not with the incumbent, who might be a stranger to the parish, or with the patron who appointed him, but with the parishioners.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barber, Rev. Robert William, Curate of Mildenhall, Suffolk; Vicar of Chippenham, Cambridgeshire.
Clark, Rev. H., M.A., Chaplain to the Hospital and Asylum of St. Peter Port, Guernsey.
Davies, Rev. Lodwick Edwards, Rector of Llangar.
Evans, Rev. John Pugh, Rector of Llanddoget.
Forster, Rev. Bennet, M.A., Vicar of Emmanuel, Camberwell.
Green, Rev. F. C., Vicar of Denmead, Hants; Organising Secretary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for Archdeaconry of Winchester.
Hart, Rev. Robert, M.A., Vicar of Takeley, Essex; Surrogate for the Diocese of St. Albans.
Hart, Rev. Dr. William, Head Master of Heversham Grammar-school; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Westmoreland, Mr. E. H. Wilson, Dallam Tower, Milnthorpe.
Hensley, Rev. Egerton John, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Luke's, Bermondsey.
Holroyde, Rev. James, M.A., Curate; Perpetual Curate of St. Andrew's, Battersea.
Lawrence, Rev. John Algernon, M.A., Licensed to officiate generally in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Lawson, Rev. F. R., Vicar of Clent, Worcestershire.
Lee, Rev. Matthew Henry, Canon of Galfridus Ruthin in St. Asaph Cathedral.
Ley, Rev. G. L. H., Rector of Chagford, Devon.
Little, Rev. C. E., Vicar of Mapperley.
Lloyd, Rev. Julius, Vicar of St. Ann's, Manchester; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Whittesley.
Madan, Rev. Nigel, M.A., Rector of West Hallam, Derbyshire; Rural Dean of Ockbrook.
Newling, Rev. W. E., Vicar of Clandown.
Page, Rev. Arnold Henry, M.A., Curate of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate; Rector of Tendring.
Scarlin, Rev. W. J., Perpetual Curate of St. Ann's, Stanley, Liverpool.
Scott, Rev. J. J., Rector of St. Clement's, Ordsal.
Sturkey, Rev. Thomas Owen, M.A., Rector of Beaumont and Kirkandrews-on-Eden.
Tomlinson, Rev. Charles Henry, M.A., Rector of Hoggeston, Bucks.
Walters, Rev. T., Rector of Llanarmon-cum-Llangybi.
Wernick, Rev. C., Curate-in-Charge of St. James's, Boston.
Woodcock, Rev. P., Vicar of St. James's, Longton, Staffordshire.
Wyatt, Rev. Henry Herbert, M.A., Vicar of Bolney, Sussex; Rector of Conington, Hunts.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blythe, Rev. Alfred Turner, Upper Langwith Rectory, Mansfield, Notts, on the 26th ult., aged 69.
Boys, Rev. Thomas James, M.A., at the Grange, Shiplake, Henley-on-Thames, on the 23rd ult.
Graystone, Rev. Arthur Conrad, 104, Lancaster-gate, Hyde Park, and Tankerton Tower, Whitstable, Kent, on the 29th ult., aged 50.
Hibbs, Rev. Richard, M.A., at 13, St. Lawrence-road, North Kensington, W., on the 26th ult, aged 74.
Hobson, Rev. George Harrison, M.A., Vicar of Guilden, Sutton, on the 26th ult.
Morrall, Rev. John, M.A., Whitchurch, Shropshire, on the 22nd ult, aged 90.
Osborne, Rev. John Francis, Rector of Eccles-next-the-Sea, at 90, Junction-road, N., on the 28th ult., aged 69.
Pinckney, Rev. Robert, Hinton Admiral Vicarage, on the 13th ult, aged 59.
Strand, Rev. Alexander, Vicar of Trinity, Hinckley, at Hinckley, on the 22nd ult., aged 44.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

By the Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D., Rector of Trinity Church, Boston, U.S.A.

Sermon Preached at an Ordination Service at St. John's Church, Caterham, on June 11, 1885.

"What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light."—Matt. x. 27.

NOT long ago these words of Jesus were found written at the beginning of his Greek Testament by one who had been for years a student of the Bible. He was a man who, to any one who knew him, must have been seen to be marked by two strong characteristics—by a deep and constant sense of the mystery and infiniteness of truth, and a strong conviction of the need of clearness and light in the work that one man does for another. That truth is very deep, and often very dark to a man's own soul, seek it as truly as he will; that truth is very precious, and that man's best work is to make truth clear to his fellow men—these were the ruling convictions of his life, and the pressingness of these two convictions appears in the selection of the text which he made the motto for his study. And who of us that in any way is sent to teach or guide his brethren has not felt very often a certain sort of conflict between the two convictions? Here are brethren all around us asking for certainties, needing certainties every moment of their lives, and what we want to do for them is to give them clear, bright light to walk by. To mistake about truth—not to know what truth is—is terrible. And who does not long to stand and speak a few words that shall be like sunbeams opening, illuminating every corner of the hearer's life? But when we come to look at our own lives, at our own selves who are to speak; when we see how the more we learn of truth the more the vastness of what we do not know opens before us, we stand wondering how it is possible that out of such darkness light can come. The duty of giving clear light grows no less imperative; but we marvel how, when we give to others that which we cannot find in ourselves—how it is possible to fulfil the commission: "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light." But the duty and the difficulty by no means belong to ministers of the Gospel alone. We are all wrong about the minister's place and function unless we consider him simply as representative—as doing, in some special ways, the self-same duties which all men must do in the more general methods that God opens to them. So this duty of speaking in the light—of bringing truth clearly to other souls than our own—belongs to every one of us; and every one of us meets the same question which the minister encounters: "How shall I speak in light that which God speaks to me in so much darkness?"

Just see what the illustrations are. Here is a mother, to whom the child is looking with the implicit faith of childhood, to whom she is infallible. He has a faith in her which never questions. Day by day he walks in the clear light which her words give him. The difference of right and wrong, the lines of what he must and must not do, the truth of God, the truth of Christ, and of the other world that is to come—this light from her teachings falls on all of these and makes them real to him. And yet, how many a time the mother, with deeper thought, has felt in what darkness it was that God spoke to her what she spoke to her boy in light; how much of mystery there was involved in what she made so plain to him! You sometimes see a man in the community who is always a source of light to all his fellow-citizens. His words cast their illumination around every subject. When a great crisis comes men stand and listen until they hear him speak, and when he has spoken the city knows its duty. But do we think that every conviction leaped in a moment into his consciousness? that he has never struggled into the certainties which he gave to other men so clearly? that it is not by some transmission through his experience, often clouded by doubt and bewilderment, that the abstract truth has passed into the clear, sharp, tangible statement of duty which his fellow citizens catch from him? But nowhere was this more evident than in the history of Christ's disciples. Two books stand next to one another in the New Testament—the Gospel of St. John and the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. What are the pictures in the two books? In the one the disciples are hearing Christ speak, and always missing His real meaning. Again and again, on page after page, we seem to see that wistful, disappointed look upon the Preacher's face. They will not understand Him. He is speaking to them in darkness. In the other book those same apostles are preaching clear, strong, definite truth from Jerusalem to Rome; that which was vague and dim has passed into them and come out from them sharp and bright; the light has been focussed in their natures and characters; and the hearts of men are springing up under its influence as it comes to them. What Jesus had told them in darkness they are now speaking in light. Can you say it was the power of the Holy Spirit which came upon them at Pentecost? But what was it that the Holy Spirit did for those disciples at Pentecost? If we leave

out God's special miraculous power, with which they were invested, was not the fruit of that wonderful event simply an effect upon the natures of the men which made them capable of doing what they afterwards rejoiced to do—capable of transmitting through their illuminated characters all the profound revelations which God gave to them in plain and helpful utterance of life and duty to their fellow men? If it were in its essence not an exceptional event, but typical of the power which the Holy Spirit was always to possess over the hearts and natures of men, is not this its true meaning—the fusing of the nature into such a new, transparent condition, that through it truth should shine in light and blessing on the world?

In these opening remarks I have indicated the subject on which I want to speak this morning. Here, on the one side, stands truth, mysterious, wonderful, and beautiful past all our finding out—truth which really and finally is no less infinite than God, truth which really ultimately is God; and here upon the other side stands man with all his varied needs, and interests, and wants—so far from being all that he ought to be, so hungry, so thirsty, so sinful, needing so in all his nature just this very truth of God. They do not find each other, they stand apart—this truth, and this humanity. What must come in between them to take the truth in one hand and to give it to humanity with the other hand? The answer is to be found in the strong impulse which in every time has, as it were, compelled certain men to try and be their brothers' teachers. With or without a formal ordination, under every creed in which men have tried to comprehend the truth of God, there always have been ministers — ministering men and women, who have known that they were called to go and stand between the truth upon the one side and man upon the other side, and somehow, by their natures and by their lives, to bring the truth and man together. Beautiful in every age and in every land has been this instinct of helpfulness, this ministry of honour and pity for their fellow men, which has always set certain men apart to be transmitters and interpreters of truth. And just as soon as any man stands there he becomes aware of the conflict of which I spoke. He is distracted between the mystery of truth and the needs of men. On the one hand, looking truth in the face and seeing how profound it is, he is tempted to give up the idea of sending that truth to men, and simply to devote himself to its own abstract contemplation; and, on the other hand, turning and looking at the clamorous needs of men, it seems too long a process to satisfy those needs with their profoundest food. It seems so much more speedy and so much more merciful to quiet this cry with any satisfaction which lies close at hand. So it is that men who set out by trying to help their fellow men in the best way are always in danger of lapsing either into self-indulgent speculation and absorption in the abstract truth upon the one hand, or into a mere temporary and superficial relief of men's superficial necessities upon the other. The Christian minister is always in both of these dangers. On the one hand, multitudes of ministers have lost themselves in the profoundest abstract speculation, and other multitudes of ministers have come to be content with the mere outside help of their fellow men, never getting at their deepest wants. How to bring the profoundest to the neediest, that seems to be the everlastingly pressing problem. There is a poor soul bereaved and desolate; what will you do for him? You have a faith in certain truths of the Divine love and human immortality; if you can get those truths to that poor broken heart they will certainly save him. You stand between those truths and that poor man; to all appearance, if they ever reach him it must be through you; God may have other means of dealing with his life, but the directest road from these truths to him lies through you. But, knowing this, have you never felt yourself powerless to send the truth that is on one side of you through yourself to the man who is on the other side of you? And then, despising yourself all the time you did it, have you never been tempted to set yourself to help him in some miserable superficial ways, trying to beguile with soft pathetic words the bereavement that was all hungering for some solid food of truth? Then it may be that God has seemed to push you aside, and set another man there, and you have stood wondering and mortified as you beheld how all his nature caught the truth upon the one side, and sent it to the man upon the other side, as a lens sends sunlight. Then you saw what it really was for a human nature to do the best work for which it was constructed, to translate the mystery of truth in the blessing of helpfulness, to utter in light what it hears in darkness, to bring the profoundest good to the neediness of man.

If I describe at all intelligibly the truth that every man has felt who has tried to be a minister to his brother man there will come this question, and it will come crowned with supreme importance: What are the qualities of that man? What sort of a man will he be who will have this power of transforming truth into helpfulness, bringing the highest motives and comforts to the lives of men? Here is the answer. He will be a man possessed alike and harmoniously by the love of truth and by the love of man. Oh, the good men whom we see, who are not helpful, who are no ministers of sacred things to human hearts! What is the trouble with them? Where is the disturbance that interferes with the transparency of their natures! Certainly, in some failure of this true proportion, this perfect harmony, this absolute mixture of the love of truth and the love of man, which thoroughly united must make a human

nature transparent, and fit for its best ministry. Perhaps the love of truth is there—the man does really love the things of God; the Father and His glory, Jesus and His love, these are his motives day and night; but on the other side of him no door is open—even in his wrapt delight there is no touch of all this human want and woe, no cry out of this clamorous human need compels his aid. Or, on the other hand, it may be that the love of man is there, the wants of his fellow creatures do affect him—he hears their cries, he sees how poor they are, and he wants to relieve them. But all the best things which they want he has not—on the side of truth his nature is not open; so he only superficially administers to what needs the most profound supply. But let them both be there—give us the soul that loves both truth and man—and then we have the true transmitting manhood. He gathers in truth by his appropriating power of love, and then issues it, not in abstract, but in clear, tangible lessons by the power of love to open upon the other side. These two affections meet in his nature, and they turn him into the transfusing making medium that he ought to be. And think again of the two ministries I spoke of a while ago. One is the mother's; she must love God and her child, and then through her doubly consecrated life God flows through her to her child in all holy things, all holy lessons. If she loves God and not her child she becomes a selfish devotee, a sentimental saint; if she loves her child and not God she becomes fond and superficial, petting and spoiling the precious soul she was meant to educate and feed. If she loves both she is the true woman, the true Christian mother. The other was the ministry of Christ's disciples. They loved Christ and they loved their brethren, the two affections met in them, and, it may be, were fused into crystal transparency by the Pentecostal fire. Therefore, they were not inhuman theologians nor sentimental philanthropists, but men whose nature and existence were always thrilling and trembling, and solemnised by the Christ they loved passing through them into interpretation to the men they loved, the mysteries of the unspeakable Saviourhood becoming, through them, to many men the strong sustaining certainties of salvation.

But turn to illustrations that are about us. You want to teach some man duty, a duty he ought to know—say, such a duty as charity. Your friend is mean and stingy. How shall you save him and make him charitable and generous? Two things are needful; you must love charity and you must love the man. You must love charity, you must go back and understand its deep laid roots, and you must see how it springs out of the perfect qualities of God. You must catch sight of how, through all creation, run the deep and subtle cords of brotherhood, and how part ministers to part, and all is knit to each as each is bound to the great central love which sends its influence through all. The mystery of charity, the copying of God's life in love through all creation, each one of His creatures embracing that love according to his capacity and degree—this stirs your enthusiasm, this takes possession of your soul and fascinates you. You love to dwell upon it, you feel its majesty and beauty. That is the first condition. But that alone does not make a fit and successful teacher of charity. You must have also love for him whom you teach. It must seem to you a sad and dreadful thing that such a nature as your friend's should have given way to meanness. You discover in him innate capacities of a generous and noble life. He might know of the joy and culture of self-sacrifice. A power wasted, a happiness missed, a goodness lost—these must appear to you when you look into his pinched and narrow face; and then, holding the boon in one hand and yearning over the desolation which you touch with the other hand, counting charity an unspeakably holy thing, and seeing the wonderful capacity of that holiness by sympathy with him you love—then you take this fulness, and you fill this emptiness with it; then you can teach the man you love the charity that you love, too.

Or it may be a duty to a truth—shall we say, the truth of Christ's Atonement? First, you must love that truth. The deep, precious, inestimable mystery that God could not leave man in sin; that He came and stood between man and Himself in the Divine humanity that He might bring man back—this must occupy your affection, your wonder, until your soul is over-running with it; not with cold apprehension, but with living love you must take hold of it. He who was perfect bowed Himself to all the conditions of our imperfection. He who was happy on the throne of everlasting joy could not rest while the poor world rolled on in sin. Love mastered law, and overcame it by fulfilling it. Past all the sacred truths that man can know that must stand out the sweetest, sacredest of truths. Then, when all this wondering delight is just ready to creep into the mere, selfish pleasure of the contemplation that your soul is saved, you must open your hearts, and bring your sinning brother to your side. His loss must weigh upon you; his case must burn and glow before you. Oh, if he only could be saved! Oh, if he could but know that Jesus lived and died for him! That soul which is trembling between the highest and the lowest, between its possible heaven and its possible hell, must seem infinitely precious to you. Then, these two loves, not keeping separate, but meeting in your heart, shall purify that heart, and make it a clear medium through which the truth of the Divine redemption shall flow into the soul that needs it and is dying for the want of it. A selfish love for the salvation of men will darken your thought of it and set you spinning silly theories

about it. Mere love for the soul of a man will make you grow sentimental and make you offer that soul weak and superficial health ; but both in you at once—love for the Saviour and love for the soul—shall bring the Saviour and the soul together, as it were, in you, and make you a true minister, the only true minister that there can be, to that man's salvation. All through you see in these two illustrations, and others that we might have used, two kinds of men, with both of which we are familiar. One is the mere abstract theorist, who has reasoned upon truth, who has been enthusiastic for it—it may be that in religion or politics he has shaped his ideas elaborately and held to them tenaciously. He is a man of thought, of study, of abstraction from the ordinary work of life. The other is a man of active usefulness, touched by the sight of human need, and wanting to relieve it—impatient in the search of principles and truths, ready often to be contemptuous to his brother living in the midst of his abstractions. Alas, what partial things we are! Among ministers there are always these two kinds of men—one forgetting his fellow men in the enthusiasm after truth, the other seeming to forget the absoluteness of truth in the quick pity for the needs of his fellow men ; one preacher seems to be willing that the world should wait until he has reached the bottom of all verities, another seems to seek only the quickest, the most comprehensible and applicable helps, never to be asking what is true, but only what is most comfortable. One prophesies the hardest truth, without any care how rough and unsympathetic it may be, and so perverts the very truth that he tries to teach ; the other prophesies "smooth things," with little care whether they be true at all, so that they only make the anxious hearer a little easier and freer. One has the love of truth without the love of man ; the other has the love of man without the love of truth. One burdens us with his darkness and lack of sympathy; the other wearies us with his superficial, thin good nature. If a man is really suffering with that deep gloom which often settles on the soul—when all that made daily life sweet is taken off; when the home is darkened ; when the friend is gone—what does he need? what is he thankful for? Not that the wisest should come in and give him, as he sits there in his desolation, elaborate and fine-spun theories about the other life, abstract disquisitions upon immortality. He listens to them, but they seem to have nothing at all to do with his friend who was here yesterday, and who is so terribly absent to-day. Still less is he satisfied if another come to him to say what is most comforting, evidently thinking more of comfort than of truth, of drawing pleasant pictures for tearful eyes to rest upon for which neither reason nor revelation has given warrant. Only when the friend who comes stands evidently with one hand on the strong rock of absolute truth, and with the other on the shaking, trembling courage of the afflicted soul—only then does the strength of the rock flow through him into the soul. "Be kind and be true both, so ye shall help me," we want to cry to any one who comes to comfort and teach us. Kindness without truth is not kind, and truth without kindness is not true. To all who have to comfort and to teach (and who is there of us, minister or layman, unto whose lot it does not sometimes fall?) is not this a lesson that must come ? Fathers, mothers, teachers, friends, ministers with every sort of ordination from other ministers, or directly from the hand of God—we who help each other need profounder experience, need profounder love of truth ourselves. Down into serious contemplation of sacred and eternal things we must go, and get help for our brother's need ; down into the darkness of those thoughts where man comes close to God, to learn there to teach in the light of our open experience with one another. Just remember parents with their flippant lives who never think a deep thought or experience a deep emotion, who do not care for principles, who never go down or go up where God lives, so that they can look on Him. Is any amount of mere fond love for their children going to make them fit teachers and guides? How will you make fit teachers and guides of children out of those who have no love for the truth? Look at the mere sentimental philanthropists—is it any wonder that their plans for the world's redemption are hazy and uncertain when they have never considered the absolute truth of things for a moment: what the world really needs, what the world really is, what is right and what is true? Is it strange that learning in the darkness they can teach nothing in the light? Nothing, I think, will be found to characterise all those who have been great among the teachers of mankind so strongly or so generally as the combination of these two great affections—love for truth and love for man. It was so with St. Paul. Sometimes we are almost puzzled: what is it that St. Paul is working for? We read his epistles: why is it that he is driven across the land and over the sea, preaching and working, until he drops at last a sacrifice and martyr at Rome? Is it for God's glory? Is it for his fellow-creatures' good? One moment he is lost in rapturous delight over the majestic and infinite mystery of God ; he is gathering out of darkness stupendous thoughts and inspirations: "How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!" The next moment he comes forth out of that darkness all radiant with the light which he has gathered, and flashing its illumination everywhere on the bright walls of Greek temples and into the eyes of the bigoted and blinded Jews: "Whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." Two things, I think, we always feel sure about Paul. First, that he never would have loved truth so if he had not wanted it to help his brethren

with; and, secondly, that he never would have cared much to help his brethren with any less help than absolute eternal truth; and it was the meeting, the entire union and harmony of those two loves in Paul, that gave his nature its wonderful transparency and transmitting power.

But why should we speak of Paul? Think how it was with Jesus. He came and stood between His father and His brethren, the Mediator between God and man; and was it His love for both that made Him perfect for His work? The two sides and pictures in His life—one where He held communion with God upon the mountain or in the garden; the other where He stood right in the crowd of men, with hands clutching at Him for help and ears wide open for his teaching—those two sides and pictures blend perfectly together and make but one gospel. Not by either alone, but by both together, is He the Saviour of the world. "For their sakes I sanctify Myself," He said to His disciples. How touching and deep and beautiful it is!—all His self-training, all His approaching and clinging to His Father, all the sanctification of Himself was for them; the power of His most ineffable, incomprehensible experience was in the hands which He laid upon the sick girl's forehead, or in the words He spoke to the woman by the well. Oh, that we who think we can help our brethren with any slight and superficial sympathy, and teach them with any stray crumbs of wisdom we have picked up anywhere on the ground—oh, that we could understand how deep Christ went, how deep Christ had to go, for all the help and teaching that He gave! Out of the darkness of the wilderness came the light of the temple; out of the darkness of the tomb came the light of the resurrection. When He hung upon the cross, it was the way in which His nature was filled with love for God and love for man at once that made Him our atonement there. One hand was upon the mercy seat of the throne; the other was upon the head of the humblest believer. But if you really want to help and save your brother do it like Christ—as profoundly, it may be as painfully, but with as complete self-dedication both to God and to your needy brother as there was in Him.

I began by speaking of the mysterious sense of incompleteness with which all truth that we are called upon to teach one another comes first to ourselves. Let me return to that for a few moments before I close. It is very different, I suppose, with different people. There are some people, I suppose, to whom such statements of doctrine as it is possible for us to make, such statements as we have received from all the ages that have gone before us, seem really to be adequate and final; but there are other men who believe those statements of doctrine, perhaps no less than those, to whom the sense of how inadequate they are to represent the truths with which they correspond is always present, and often makes the question how to teach those truths very difficult and anxious. I cannot speak to men who are just entering upon the active work of the Christian ministry without alluding to that difficulty; let us look at it for a moment. We certainly must hold the fact, if we are really thoughtful, that the truths of God are greater and richer than any of our statements—than any of the statements that the Christian Church has ever been able to make of them can express. The truth of the Trinity, for instance. Do I suppose that all the true meaning of the whole nature of the Infinite God is adequately written in the Nicene Creed? Certainly not. That Creed is a formula which puts to our comprehension such of the truth of God as can be put in words like those. We may believe it wholly, and yet be sure that in the higher vision of the other life God will be truer and deeper and greater to us than the Creed has ever told us that He is. We may believe that the impression which the creed gives us is a right impression, and yet we may be sure that it is only part, and that other truths about God must find other statements than are given there. Holding this, what will be our idea about the possibility of teaching what we thus believe, but what we know to be imperfect? There are two answers to this. One man may say: "Never suggest that there is any more to teach than the Creed"—as if that were absolutely all. "Never allow your hearer's mind to be bewildered for a moment with the prospect that some day it will be called upon to open, to enlarge and change its thought of God. No matter in what darkness you have learned, this is the way to teach everything in perfect light." To say nothing about its impossibility, that is not honest, and so certainly cannot be best. Another says: "Since nothing is final nothing can be certain, so you can teach nothing. Dwell with what pleasure and strength you can yourself upon your partial statement, but you certainly cannot teach in the light what you have learned in so much darkness. You must sit and fold your hands until, perhaps, some day the real light shall break on teacher and on learner both." But we cannot be satisfied with either of such methods; we believe it is not necessary to be satisfied with either of them. We believe that however inadequate our statement of truth may be, still it is true, and, bearing its inadequacy always in our mind, we still have such a knowledge as may serve us for a law of life and lead us towards a fuller comprehension—such, therefore, as we may rejoice to teach our brethren. For is there any knowledge that is perfect? Is it not true of every knowledge we have that its best statements are but imperfect formulas which represent from afar off what we by no means have fully been around and comprehended, what we cannot completely know? And yet upon these knowledges

we act, and by our faithful use of them we are always coming nearer to perfect knowledge. The seaman knows but the beginning of the mysteries of the winds and waves, and yet, using the knowledge he has, he leads his ship across the ocean to the harbour on the other side. The statesman learns in darkness the principles of national life; yet, out of that darkness he brings clear laws of government, and guides his people into brighter and brighter understanding of the principles of government. The doctor knows how full of mystery are still the human body and the world of drugs, and yet he cures our sickness and wins our gratitude. So everywhere we act upon imperfect knowledge which is true as far as it goes, and correctly, though inadequately, represents the perfect truth. And so with Christ. Who of us claims to know that nature wholly? I know that when we come to heaven we shall see Him as we do not see Him now; but yet the Christ we know now is the true Christ, though not the whole Christ. I am sure that it is right for me to love and trust Him as if I knew Him perfectly. I am sure that all that He shall ever show my raptured and enlightened sight of Him — of His mercy and His power — will deepen my love and trust, but never can make me ashamed or sorry for that poor, feeble, ignorant trust and love which I have been able to give Him here. And here I am able—and here is one great and good result of all this conscious ignorance—I am able to believe that other men who seek the same Christ, but seek Him differently, may still be right; and I am sure, as I could not be sure if I thought my knowledge was complete and absolutely exhaustive—I know, I am able to believe, that they have been brought to see other parts of His exhaustlessness; and so all this truth brings me charity and gives me the blessed right and privilege of toleration. Still, what I do know of Christ I love and follow. They are not uncertainties, but certainties as yet to be revealed; and through the reasonableness of the principle which He Himself laid down, and by the obedience of what we love and know already, we shall be always led into the knowledge of far more. That principle unlocks the gates of everlasting growth. If o'er me stretches the continual revelation of my Lord, eternity shall never grow so old that to the end of it I shall not be more and more obedient to Christ, more and more wise in Christ for ever.

And so the issue of it all will be for every man who teaches other men of Christ that he must always have two qualities in his teaching. First, he must teach as a fellow learner, he must teach, not as an oracle who knows the whole, but teach his brother scholar with humble soul, knowing some part and eager to grasp hands with every earnest man and go on to the knowledge of the rest. And, secondly, he will always teach, as he has always experienced, that richer knowledge can only come by more complete obedience and spiritual trust. He will not dare to hope himself, nor let any brother hope, that by the struggle of the intellect alone can man ever discover God. "Come," he will cry to all whom his voice can reach—"come, let us serve Him together, and so together we shall serve Him here and hereafter, more and more, known with ever ripening knowledge." Oh, fathers, mothers, friends, ministers, scholars, we must give one another all the light we can. To love truth, on the one hand, and our brethren, on the other—to love God and to love God's children—that will make our human nature transparent, so that God can shine through it. That is our only hope for this one thing—we are sure of that; no man ever yet loved Christ and loved his brother that Christ did not find His own way through that man into that man's brother, and so help and enlighten both the humble teacher and the learner. May that give courage to all of us who are sent to teach and to learn.

May it give courage to you, my brethren, who are to-day to receive ordination and commission to work for Christ's Gospel. And may I say one word to you before I leave? I do rejoice with you in the ordination which you are to receive to-day It is the noblest commission it is possible for man to receive with reference to any work that he can do for his fellow men on the face of God's earth. I rejoice with you still more in the privilege of the life opened to you in your ministry; I rejoice with you in the possibility of all this that I have been trying to say. I rejoice with you that you bear those human natures that are capable of being thus made transparent and translucent to the life of God. I rejoice with you that it is possible for you in the lives which you shall live, that it is possible for all men, but peculiarly possible for you in the special work in which you shall be engaged—that it is possible for you so to love truth upon the one side and to love men upon the other side that your natures may be, not changed into something different, but developed into their best; that you may be led to the richest and clearest things that human natures can become; that you may do the noblest work and function that human natures can perform, of sending that truth which lies waiting here to the men who are standing there, and bless them with the light of God. To know that our ordination to that ministry does not make us something less than men, but lifts us to the best privileges of manhood, consecrates us to that which all good men, everywhere, inside and outside of all ordinations of the Church, are living for—to know that it consecrates us supremely to that for which God makes our human life, the communication of Himself to other lives,—that is the richest consciousness that can come to us as we kneel to receive the benediction of all the venerable Church. I rejoice with you supremely that you are becoming ministers of the Church to-day in this age of time, in

this point of the history of the world. I will not listen for one moment to the feeble talk which tells me that the great days of the Christian ministry are passed. I rejoice in every false *prestige* which has passed away from the ministerial character and the ministerial name. I rejoice that the clergyman stands to-day in the presence of the community in which he is to work, ready to be judged by them according to the faithfulness of the work he does. I rejoice in the opener contact of all classes with one another, men of all degrees, of all occupations and professions, because it does give a nobler chance for the man who is fit to do it—to do the work of the Christian minister in the world. With all my soul I do believe there never has been a time since the days of the apostles when it was so good to be a minister of Jesus Christ as it is to-day. There never was a time when it was possible for man to know the rich humanity and the deep divinity of Jesus Christ; there never was a time when it was so possible for a man to know how absolutely and infinitely God gave Himself to us in the Incarnation; there never was a time when man might come so close to his brother-man and speak in light which in darkness and difficulty and tumultuous experience he is still receiving from God. With this great welcome into that which belongs to the Christian ministry in all ages, with that which belongs to every ministry—essentially to the Christian ministry—the richer, deeper humanity, the larger meaning of the life to which it consecrates him who becomes a Christian minister—with this special welcome into the ministry of to-day, with its ever enlarging prospect and ever richer possibilities, you who are younger men are going to have nobler opportunities of exercising the Christian ministry than belong to us whose ministry is older. The world from year to year is going to grow more able to understand God, more able to come into sympathy with man; and to know God's truth by deep experience, and to sympathise with men in the riches of human brotherhood,—these two things, as I have tried to say this morning, blending harmoniously in a man's character, make the true Christian ministry. Upon your ministry as you exercise it thus may the richest blessing of our heavenly Father rest.

THE Bishop of Carlisle leaves England on Wednesday for a short holiday. He will go to New York *via* Liverpool with Miss Goodwin. His lordship's next general ordination will take place in Carlisle Cathedral on Trinity Sunday.

THE Archbishop of York has become one of the patrons of the Church Army. With the sanction of the Dean of Westminster, there will be a special celebration at 7.45 a.m., on the 7th of May, for the officers and friends at their next conference. A considerable number of adults have recently been confirmed, as the result of Church Army work in Barnard Castle and Portsea.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, 1886.

## THE B.D. DEGREE AT DURHAM.

AS will be seen in our advertising columns, the University of Durham are setting an admirable example to other Universities in conferring its higher degrees, especially in divinity, by examination and not simply by vote of Convocation. This will be the means of encouraging the clergy to keep up and to extend their theological study. The Divinity School of this University, which is now perhaps equal, if not superior, in ability and scholarship to that of any other University, has done much in the past to promote the efficient training and education of theological students. For example, in 1880 it was enacted that students who had completed their residence and passed all their examinations, at any of the following Theological Colleges—St. Aidan's, St. Augustine's, St. Bee's, Chichester, Cumbrae, Edinburgh, Gloucester, Lichfield, Lincoln; the Theological Department of King's College, London; and the Theological Department of Queen's College, Birmingham;—may obtain the Degree of B.A. at Durham by residing three terms there, and passing the final examination in Arts. Thus such a student entering the University in October, can obtain a degree the following June. We have always thought that this University, by thus allying and affiliating itself with the Theological Colleges, has conferred a real service on the Church and nation. It has been thought, not without reason, that small and exclusive theological seminaries have a tendency to narrow the views and sympathies of their *alumni*, and to foster a spirit of clericalism, if not of actual superstition and spiritual arrogance. If this be true the University, by offering to extend and liberalise the instruction of these candidates for Holy Orders, has done what it could to remedy the defects and shortcomings of the Colleges, and to supply the people with liberally educated and publicly tested and accredited ministers. It now makes another judicious move for perfecting these clergymen in their professional studies by offering the B.D. degree by examination. It has always struck us as somewhat of an abuse and scandal, that the higher degrees in Arts and in the faculties

of Law, Physic, and Divinity, were obtainable in most Universities by the payment of fees and the make-believe of an examination and the keeping of "Acts." The value of such degrees would be much raised in public estimation, if they were as a rule only granted after a real examination or appraisement of attainments as *bonâ fide* vouchers for the possession of science or literature. In the biographical sketch of R. A. Proctor, B.A., F.R.S., in "Men of the Time," it is stated "that he has not proceeded to his M.A. degree, for the reason that it is not like the B.A. degree (at least at Cambridge), a title representing work done, but money paid." We hold that the sale of a degree, more especially in any of the faculties, is immoral, quite as much so as the sale of the next presentation to a Church living. It is calculated to mislead, if not to perpetrate an actual fraud on, the public; consequently it is dishonouring to both the vendor and the purchaser. We are glad, therefore, to see that the Durham University has instituted a special B.D. degree, to be obtained only by examination. The list of subjects proposed for the examination in June, 1887, is a practicable and sensible one, but in subsequent examinations we hope to see a knowledge of Hebrew made compulsory instead of optional. Inasmuch as both Moses and Christ were sanitary as well as moral teachers, as were nearly all their immediate disciples, we are of opinion that the study of the sciences of physiology and pathology would throw more light on the interpretation of Holy Scripture than either dogmatics, liturgiology, or philosophy. Certainly they would prove equally, if not more useful to the clergy in these days, when they aspire to lead public opinion on such vitally important questions as marriage, and the prevention of hereditary diseases. Surely there must be some radical defect or *desideratum* in the education of our ministers of Christ Jesus, when Mr. Stansfield, Mr. Gladstone's Minister of Public Health, is enabled, mainly by their assistance in the agitation, to repeal the Contagious Diseases' Acts of Parliament, which are proved to have done more than all other sanitary Acts put together to improve the health and thereby the morality of the people. Doubtless the clergy have acted thus in ignorance, and in the mistaken belief that they were thereby promoting sexual morality. There could not be a more disastrous mistake, as they would realise if they had a firmer faith in the sanitary teaching of the Bible, or if they culled a smattering of the two sciences we have named from God's Book of Nature. Nothing is more injurious to, and destructive of, the whole mental and moral nature of man than hereditary disease which extends to several generations. It is inexpressibly sad that so many of the bishops, clergy, and nearly all the dissenting ministers should practically assent to and endorse Mr. Stansfield's misleading and anti-Christ-like injunction: "Heal not the sick; cleanse not the lepers; let them not be saved from the effects of their sins; because health and purity do not conduce to morality." The best measure to be taken for unlearning this false, sentimental, and most injurious religion that occurs to us is to invite, if not compel, all theological students to acquire some practical acquaintance with the above-mentioned natural sciences, which are the unambiguous and unsophistical declarations of the Almighty to the whole human family.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### FREE TRADE.

SIR,—I cannot say anything that will be satisfactory or convincing to your correspondents in to-day's PULPIT who treat of Free Trade; they are not possessed of the essential economical conceptions, without which the points in question cannot be thoroughly understood. I can but say a few words which may guard some of your readers from falling into some of the errors of your correspondents.

The "fundamental doctrine of free trade" is not exploded; it is all but universally accepted. The doctrine is, that a condition of unrestrained freedom in production and in exchange is that under which production results in the greatest amount of wealth. All the legislative action of all the countries in the world that runs counter to this principle is defended on the ground only that in the especial case (or cases) where law imposes restrictions, this is done because the case is exceptional. This defence, which forms the whole argument of the Fair Trade school, is in fact based on the principle, or recognises it. Mr. Gurney is the only "thinker" that I have met with for years, who denounces competition as such.

The statement that Mr. Sandlands gives of the reasoning of the Germans may be correct; the reasoning is not. If the system founded on it were really carried out, it would put a stop to all international trade whatever. The notion is based on the idea, which is contrary to fact, that by nourishing by prohibition or bounties any particular branch of production, that branch is added to the total production of the protected area, instead of, as does occur, the protected branch displacing some other.

When I meet such a saying as that trade increased in spite of, and not in consequence of, Free Trade, I can only think that to repeat it is to reply to it. If the more you hamper trade the more you will have of it, why then the less of a thing you have the more you have. The question that follows, Why is trade so bad now? is a proper one. I shall answer it presently.

I do not understand what is meant by saying that we have paid our way for the last twenty years out of our hoarded capital; and I do not understand how iron and coal, not yet extracted out of the ground, can be hoarded capital. The amount of English hoarded capital has increased during the last twenty years by at least 40 per cent.; and we have paid our way all the time. As for the time when our mines shall come to be exhausted, that is a question for engineers,

not for economists. Mr. Gurney appears to claim Adam Smith as an opponent of Free Trade, which is contrary to the common reading of the "Wealth of Nations." Indeed, the only restriction on freedom of trade that Smith recommends, is that on shipping. I think, had he lived till the time when he would have seen the British commercial flag assuming the superiority over all others put together, owing directly to the repeal of the Navigation Acts, he, who made so few mistakes, would have corrected himself in this.

No old country, it is said, can compete against new countries in agricultural produce. We are at present receiving a great supply of wheat from India ; and India, I suppose, is an old country. Italy, another old country, exports large amounts of agricultural produce. Austria is not a new country ; and we receive as much Hungarian flour as ever they can grind.

Mr. Gurney considers it "the first and primary duty of every state to secure the interests of labour, and promote production by endeavouring to secure a reasonable profit to the producer." This is not my conception of the state's proper function. I think the chief function of the state is to protect the rights of all its subjects and its own rights ; and I think it discharges its duty in matters of trade the best, when it leaves that to people's selves, as they understand it better than any state does. Mr. Gurney has not made a discovery in recognising the fact that production must precede consumption. It is a common saying that you cannot eat a cake and have it ; and it has been known for long that you cannot eat it till you have it first.

I said in my letter in the PULPIT of this day week, that a "wave" of low prices is passing over the commercial world. That "wave" covers both America and Australia. American corn and pork are cheaper than ever they were ; and many American manufactured goods are so cheap, that they are sent to this country for sale to some extent. Wool, the chief product of Australia, is at about (I have not the figures, but I am near the fact), half the price that it was twenty years ago. This universal condition of low prices is the cause of bad trade, which is nearly as universal ; and that condition is caused by a change in the value of gold, which during the last fifteen years has been absorbed in the various coinages of the world faster than it has been produced through the displacement of silver. If this be questioned, the fact of prices in the silver countries now advancing proves it. This is a mischief that no "protection" can mend ; although it can aggravate it.

B.

April 3rd, 1886.

---

SIR,—Since writing you on the 21st March, I have been refreshing my memory as to the former condition of the labouring classes by inquiry of those who have been long enough employers of labour to be able to speak, from their own knowledge, of what that condition was about the time of the repeal of the corn laws ; that is, before the alteration of our fiscal system had had time to affect it. I find that merchants, manufacturers, contractors, agriculturists and builders all agree that, so far as the rate of wages may be accepted as an indication of that condition, it was a vastly inferior one to that which has subsequently, up to the present time, existed. The ratio of increase in wages from about 1846 to the present time is variously stated, the lowest estimate being about 33 per cent. and the highest about 80 per cent., the mean of the quotations given me being about 54 per cent. But it has been impressed upon me by those whom I have consulted that the increase of wages forms by no means the whole of the advantages that the present wage earning classes possess over their predecessors. On the contrary it is felt, and rightly so, that they are very largely participators in all those ameliorations of the condition of life which are the products of the art, science, and mutual co-operation of modern times. It is sufficient to mention in illustration cheap postage, cheap travelling, cheap and good education, literature and amusement, more healthy homes, better medical aid, cheaper clothing, and cheaper and better food ; all of which are advantages having much more than a mere money value. All these things are known, by those who are best informed, to be the present heritage of the working man ; and if it be not claimed that he is indebted to Free Trade for all of them, it equally cannot be asserted that it has militated against his obtaining them. But now comes the interesting question, in what mood has he received them, and what use does he make of them? Well, on the whole it may be conceded that he has not done very badly. He is perhaps a little bit greedy, and somewhat inflated ; friends and foes make an absurd fuss about him, use him as a "piece" in the dishonest game of politics, and do what they can to spoil him ; and he gives way every now and then to little excitements (when he is in galumphing mood) that remind one that when "Jeshurun waxed fat he kicked." But the British Jeshurun is, after all, a fairly quiet going animal ; and it has been a pleasure to see that his improved physical conditions have not been altogether unaccompanied by improved moral and intellectual ones, which have shown themselves by some slight culture both of mind and manners. We have then, as a result, the fact that the wage earning class has not only been happier, but better, since the establishment of Free Trade, than it was before.

But, as it may be objected that this is only a local and provincial view, I shall hope in a future letter to quote some authoritative statistical tables, which will be found to give facts greatly in excess of what I have stated ; and I shall also show what is the opinion of those, who, from their position at the very centre of information, and from training and natural capacity, are the best fitted to guide our judgment on the subject.

I had written thus far before I got your last number and read Mr. Gurney's letter of the 27th March. A few words are necessary in reply. I have shown above that it is not true that there has been any distress of the population, taken as a whole, till quite recently. The reverse is the truth. I now wish to point out that it is a mere assumption that the present distress is due to Free Trade. No evidence is adduced in support of it. Then it is useless to talk of no country being "dependant on another" for what "it can produce at home," when it is admitted that this country cannot produce enough of the prime necessity—food. The masses are not going to have their bellies pinched in the interest of "the peers, the landed gentry, and the representatives of hereditary power and virtue," as is virtually proposed by Mr. Gurney ; nor would he or they really wish it ; and the idea of legislation in their interests but ill accords with the sentiments expressed by him in his letter which appeared in your number of 13th March. Then again, he would have us believe that diminished trade is an evil confined to this country. The following quotation from Mr. Bateman's paper on "Customs Tariffs," read

before the British Association at Aberdeen, in September, 1885, will serve to correct this opinion. Mr. Bateman says, "Comparing the first six months of the present year with 1883, the last year of the short revival, French imports and exports have each declined 6 per cent. in value; Italian imports have increased 16 per cent., and exports declined 25 per cent.; United States imports have declined 20 per cent., and exports 15 per cent.; while the United Kingdom has declined 11 per cent. in both imports and exports." German returns were incomplete, but showed a decrease of 10 per cent. on the exports of the principal manufactured articles. He adds, "The present depression of trade and agriculture is by no means confined to this country, but is universal, and is, to a great extent, a depression of value and not quantity." Mr. Gurney's prophecy of the future I will leave the future to reply to. It is dangerous to prophesy unless one knows, and I am not a "seer."

H. W.

April 4th, 1886.

## DOGMA AND PHILOSOPHY.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to point out to your readers that Mr. Gurney and I are using the word dogma in somewhat different senses. He says, "revelation and dogma are synonymous, or one, at least, involves the other." I said that by dogma I understood—not the Bible—but certain interpretations of the Bible, those interpretations, viz., which professed to be final and complete, and which were set up as barriers against further investigation.

A. W. MOMERIE.

## ST. PAUL THE AUTHOR OF THE ACTS AND OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—I have not seen the book in which Mr. Heber Evans contends for this paradox, but I assume that your reviewer correctly states its avowed intention, to find "a solid standpoint against the school of Baur, Renan, and Zeller." More fatal tactics could not well be adopted. If the Tübingen School cannot be answered in any better way, then the Tübingen School had better be left unanswered. Baur himself admits that not a suspicion of unauthenticity attaches to the four great Epistles of St. Paul—1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians—and out of them we can get all that is needed for the foundations of Christianity, together with a good deal of the superstructure.

About the thesis of Mr. Evans's volumes I have no intention of arguing, any more than of arguing that the earth is not flat, but I quote a few words of authority.

In his great work on *St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp* Bishop Lightfoot says: "*No critical result* relating to the New Testament seems to me *more certain* than that the Acts of the Apostles was written by *a companion* of St. Paul" (I. p. 402). This from a writer who weighs evidence with such sagacity and discernment, and who states results with such caution and fairness as the Bishop of Durham, may serve as a safeguard against rash hypotheses.

Dr. Hobart has no doubt run into excesses in attempting to prove that so much of St. Luke's language is medical, but a fair test of his theory would be to see whether anything approaching to the same amount of medical and quasi-medical language can be found in any other two Books of the New Testament.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Durham, April 4th.

## FARMERS—IRISH BOARDS OF NOMINATION.

SIR,—Allow me a word in reply to "an Irishman, not ashamed, etc." He is right in saying that every parish is filled up by a Board consisting of, first, the bishop; second, two clergymen and one layman, elected by the Synod of the diocese; this Synod consisting of all licensed clergymen of the diocese, and of two laymen for each clergyman, such laymen chosen by the vestry of each parish. But as the Synod, consisting of twice as many laymen as clerics, vote for both clerical and lay members for the Board of Nomination; the three members, two clerics and one layman, are virtually appointed by the lay members of the Synod, who are themselves sent up by the vestries of the several parishes. So far we have the Diocesan Board consisting of the bishop, two clerics and one layman, the whole, except the bishop, the creatures of the vestries. But to these four there are added, in the case of each parish, three laymen elected by the vestry. It is the custom, when these three agree, to appoint their man. So I may say that the three men, elected by the vestry, fill up the parish. Now, in most country parishes, the vestry consists of farmers, so that I am borne out in saying that our country parishes are filled up by farmers.

2. "An Irishman not ashamed, etc.," quotes a late election to the parish of Enniskillen. This, he thinks, contradicts my assertion, that our patronage is entirely in the hands of farmers. But Enniskillen is a large town, with two noblemen with influence over the other nominators. No one doubts that resident landlords, if popular, will have influence. I am supposing a case where the farmers, the three nominees of the vestry, are left to their own devices.

3. I was, for some years, curate in a Shropshire parish. Our vestry, if on the Irish plan, there being no gentlemen in the parish, would have appointed three farmers, all of Methodist tendency.

4. In Ireland a man may be on the select vestry merely on professing himself a Churchman. He may be a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, a Plymouth Brother, or anything else. He is not required to deny that he is a *schismatic*. I have known a leading Moravian in Dublin a member of our general Synod.

5. "An Irishman who is not ashamed, etc.," takes for his motto *Ex uno disce omnes;* I take for mine "circumstances alter cases," and "one swallow does not make a summer."

6. I knew a parish in which not a penny was given by any vestryman, synodsman or nominator, to any fund, parochial, diocesan or general. Even to the Sunday collection, the principal gentleman, with his imitators, refused to contribute, walking out before the offertory, because the curate made it after the sermon instead of before.

7. Peers and landlords have influence, as "an Irishman, etc." shows. Very true, but suppose it is given to make the farmers take the wrong tack!

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

## IS SILENCE AN EFFECTIVE CORRECTOR OF ERROR?

SIR,—I was struck by some observations in the PULPIT of last Saturday. They are in a review of Dr. Cox's "Expositions." The Reviewer says, "the doctrine of the larger hope . . . . . unless very carefully handled, is an exceedingly dangerous doctrine." He also states, that he himself "has never once preached it, and never will, he thinks, although he holds it."

If he "holds" the doctrine of the larger hope, he must believe it is true, and in that case, he must inevitably regard the conceptions which have been generally entertained as being seriously and even disastrously wrong, in spite of the official stamp of "orthodox" which they bear. How, in the name of all that is rational, does he expect errors to be corrected, unless by "exposition?"

John Foster, who was a teacher of religion, as well as an essayist of lasting repute, declared confidentially in 1841, that he did not believe in endless depravity and misery. He added, in a letter to Rev. E. White, "a number (not large, but of great piety and intelligence) of ministers within my acquaintance, several now dead, have been disbelievers of the doctrine in question; at the same time not feeling themselves called upon to make a public disavowal; content with employing in their ministrations, strong general terms in denouncing the doom of impenitent sinners." Those reticent teachers of religion can never be regarded as heralds of bright and consolatory hopes, to those who were oppressed and bewildered by ferocious conceptions and prospects. But Thomas Erskine, a layman, who was more communicative, at that very period, will always have his name cherished in grateful remembrance.

To one who has sentiments like those of Thomas Erskine, it must appear marvellously strange, to hear about the dangers of the "larger hope," without a word about the dangers of an enormous criminal population, incalculable in its untold myriads, which is to pester the universe, irremediably and endlessly, with a mass of anguish, depravity and malignity utterly beyond all powers of imagination. If the reviewer were told that it was intended to revive the practice of torture and burning alive, he would not remain silent, even though assured that those forms of castigation would be restricted to murderers guilty of atrocious cruelties. He would feel that he must speak out, and so, I suppose, would all the Evangelicals, although aware that the pain and agony endured, would hardly last an hour. Yet he thinks it would be dangerous to enter a protest against doctrines, which ascribe barbarities of endless duration to the Ruler of the universe, who is also the Creator, and is the Sustainer of all life, "in whom we live, and move, and have our being;" who is, moreover, declared to be essentially, permanently, unalterably Light and Love.

It is interesting, though sad, to reflect that Universal Restoration was an open question in the early period of the Church, until the fatal genius of Augustine enslaved Christendom, and imposed an avowed belief in a system of the universe, presenting horrors and incongruities far beyond the most ferocious conceptions of the heathen. No deliverer arose, and the only alleviation was another form of mental slavery, in the shape of a strong sacerdotal system, which, as Milman remarks, "reconciled Christendom with the Augustinian theology;" although, as he admits, the principles of the one are logically inconsistent with the other.

It is of the greatest importance for teachers of religion to set forth with earnest entreaty and solemn warning, the affecting and awful lessons, which the sacred volume and real life exhibit, in regard to sin and its consequences, in this life and beyond the grave. The omission to do this may, I think, be fairly charged on preachers in general, and not specially on such as entertain brighter hopes than others concerning ultimate results.

The action of sin is indeed fearful and appalling, and the Creator upholds, with unrelenting rigour, the relations between causes and effects. But there is a potent influence stronger than sin, and even in this life, we sometimes see that the superior energy of moral good can vanquish evil, under the divine appointment and blessing. I greatly rejoice in perceiving clear declarations in the sacred volume, that God Himself will accomplish that which Christians are encouraged to essay in the words, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

J. B.

Surbiton, 6th April, 1886.

## THE BLACK RUBRIC.

SIR,—Your thoughtful correspondent "Presbyter" perhaps shows a compatibility between the doctrine of transubstantiation and those words in the Black Rubric which speak of the "Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ," but can any reconciliation be effected between transubstantiation and the words, "The sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances"? Very few would wish the subscription of the clergy to the formularies to be interpreted in the strictest sense, but if direct contradiction to a controversial definition, or rather a definition on a subject which was the subject of keen controversy, be recognised as lawful, there seems nothing left to keep men who hold *any* forbidden doctrine or negation of doctrine out of the ministry of our Church, except where words occur in the services which may be unpleasant for some to use.

I don't doubt "Presbyter's" accuracy in saying that the doctrine of a substance distinct from its accidents (I have not his letter before me and possibly miss his meaning) has disappeared from philosophy, but this doctrine seems the readiest way of believing in an objective existence of the external world. I daresay the true way of escape from Berkeley has never been thought of yet, and is perhaps, by us men, unthinkable. But what does "Presbyter" say? I don't think he is a Berkeleian?

ERIGENA.

## Reviews and Notices.

"THE INTERPRETER." April, 1886. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

THE continuation of Canon Rawlinson's "Introduction to the Book of Isaiah" is most unsatisfactory. It is written with a bias against the divided-authorship theory, which we can only call absurd. To write

"under the former head [the historical circumstances implied in the disputed chapters] the sole ground urged is the stand-point occupied by the writer of the later chapters, which is that of an exile in Babylon," is something like writing that the "sole ground" for thinking a man is a dissenter is that he always goes to chapel and invariably speaks in favour of disestablishment. Surely if a writer occupies the stand-point of an exile in Babylon, the reasonable inference is that he WAS an exile in Babylon, which the historic Isaiah, who wrote the earlier chapters, certainly was not.

If the "great unnamed" exile wrote them, then he wrote the greatest, grandest, noblest exhortation, sermon—poem—call it what you will—ever penned; their object and meaning is perfectly clear and simple; but if Isaiah wrote them, then they are a puzzle in themselves, and they mar the simplicity and clearness of his previous prophecies.

Mr. Younge's "Study in St. Luke" seems to us to contain a very needless puzzle. Writing on the Transfiguration he says, "The question with all reverence occurs, how did Moses and Elias know of [His exodus], how could they speak of it beforehand?" Surely Jesus told them of it Himself.

We are very glad to have another paper, the eighth, by Professor Bruce on "The Kingdom of God," and another by Mr. Deane on "The difficulties of Scripture." The latter deals with the question of the ages of the patriarchs. We think that Mr. Deane does not sufficiently see that the Semitic mind viewed dates and figures in a very different light to what we do—how could a people for whom the same word sufficed for an ox, a thousand, and a family, have thought numerical exactness a necessity?

The other papers are by Professor Reynolds, Professor Sayce, and Dr. Cheyne, and are all interesting.

THE Central Council will meet on Tuesday and Wednesday next. Amongst the *agenda* are resolutions on Church Extension, Church Defence Organisation, Church Councils and the co-operation of the Laity, Church Patronage, Glebe Lands and Tithe Rent-charge Extraordinary, and Clergy Pensions.

ON Saturday, April 3rd, 1886, the Rev. Robert Linklater, vicar of Holy Trinity, Stroud Green, received back into the communion of the Church of England the Rev. William George Rouse, formerly Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford, and curate of Bedminster, and of St. Johns, Bury St. Edmunds.

ON the 27th ult. the infant daughter of Mr. P. F. Willert, Fellow and Tutor of Exeter, and of Headington Hill, was baptised in the College Chapel, by the Rev. Professor Sanday, another of the Fellows. Such an event is worthy of record from the fact that within living memory no baptism has taken place either in the new or the old chapel. There is no font in the building, and a substitue, consisting of a Gothic trefoil-shaped oak table, on which was placed a massive and handsomely designed epergne, belonging to the college, inside of which was inserted an old-fashioned china basin, was used, and which answered the purpose admirably. As the chapel is in the parish of St. Michael's, the baptism was registered in the books of that parish. Mr. Willert entertained at a luncheon afterwards, at the bursary, the sponsors and friends who were present.—*Oxford Journal.*

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barker, Rev. R., M.A., Rector of Fulletby.
Baxter, Rev. C. Parkhurst, Chaplain of the Central London Sick Asylum, Cleveland Street, and Assistant Chaplain to the Thames Church Mission.
Browne, Rev. Rupert Montague, Vicar of St. Paul's, Thornton Heath; Rector of Rushock.
Clark, Rev. Samuel, Incumbent of St. Paul's, Aberdeen; Vicar of St. Cuthbert with Holy Trinity, Thetford.
Clarkson, Rev. John M., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Carysfort*.
Clayton, Rev. Edward, Hon. Canon of Chester, late Vicar of Iffley, Oxon, Parkstone, Dorset; licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Collard, Rev. E. C., Vicar of Stratford-sub-Castle, near Salisbury.
Crucefix, Rev. Robert Harmer, Curate of Chalfont St. Peter; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Wilmcote.
Godley, Rev. Edward Richard, Rector of West Chelborough.
Green, Rev. W. Graham, B.A., Vicar of Leaton.
Hancock, Rev. John William, B.A., Vicar of Kelstern.
James, Rev. C. H., M.A., Senior Curate of Haigh-cum-Aspull; Vicar of Haigh.
Jellicoe, Rev. G. S., M.A., Incumbent of St. John's, Littlehampton, Sussex.
Lawson, Rev. Frederick Robert, Curate of Pershore; Vicar of Clent.
M'Swiney, Rev. John Henry Herbert, M.A., Rector of Barnoldby-le-Beck.
Mathews, Rev. Canon, Vicar of St. Lawrence, Appleby; Rural Dean of Appleby and Kirkby Stephen.
Mogg, Rev. H. H., Vicar of Chittoe, near Chippenham.
Owen, Rev. Edward Henry, M.A., Vice-Principal of Leamington College; Rector of Birdingbury.
Protheroe, Rev. J. H., Vicar of Aberystwith.
Richmond, Rev. William, M.A.; Rector of East Chelborough, otherwise Lewcombe.
Tarlton, Rev. T. H., M.A., Rector of Lutterworth; Chap'ain to the High Sheriff of Leicestershire.
Taylor, Rev. Walter Henry, M.A., Vicar of Hindon.
Waller, Rev. Charles E., M.A., Vicar of Hanford.
Wyatt, Rev. Turner Geoffrey, M.A., Curate of Hayward s Heath; licensed to the Lectureship of Ludlow.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Ashley, Rev. John, LL.D., eldest son of the late John Ashley, Esq., of Ashley Hall, parish of Vere, Jamaica, at his residence, 6, The Grove, Clapham Common, on the 30th ult., in his 86th year.
Boys, Rev. Thomas James, M.A., formerly Curate of Ivychurch, at the Grange, Shiplake, Henley-on-Thames, on the 23rd ult., aged 74.
Brown, Rev. Frederick, formerly Rector of Nailsea, Somerset, at Fern Bank, Beckenham, on the 1st inst., aged 70.
Capper, Rev. D., M.A., late Rector of Huntley, at 23, Imperial Square, Cheltenham, on the 2nd inst., aged 81.
Chevenix-Trench, Rev. Francis, formerly Rector of Islip, Oxfordshire, at Burlesdon, Hants, on the 3rd inst., aged 79.
Colvile, Rev. Frederick Leigh, M.A., late Vicar of Leek Wootton, at Kempsey, Bournemouth, on the 28th ult.
Griffiths, Rev. John Frederic, B.A., late Curate of Sedgley, and formerly Chaplain of H.M.S. *Victor Emmanuel*, at Southport, on the 13th inst.
Sumner, Rev. John Maunior, Rector of Buriton and Petersfield, eldest son of Charles Richard, formerly Bishop of Winchester, at Buriton Rectory, on the 1st inst., aged 69.
Terrot, Rev. Charles Pratt, at Wispington Vicarage, on the 3rd inst., aged 83. He had been Vicar of Wispington forty-eight years.
Townshend-Boyle, Hon. and Rev. Richard Cavendish, M.A., Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty, only surviving son of Edmund, eighth Earl of Cork and Orrery, at Huntercombe Manor, Maidenhead, on the 31st ult., aged 74.
Vibert, Rev. John Este, M.A., late Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge, Head Master of St. Aubin's School, Jersey, on the 31st ult., aged 48.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## EVOLUTION AND THE INCARNATION.

By Rev. Professor BONNEY, D.Sc, LL.D., F.R.S.

Sermon Preached on Behalf of the Christian Evidence Society, at St. James's, Piccadilly, on Sunday, March 21st, 1886.

"The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God."—Luke i. 35.

IN a well-known work, written some twenty years since, occurs a passage of which the following is a translation:—"Mankind regarded collectively, presents to us an assemblage of beings, low, selfish. . . But from the midst of this uniform vulgarity, columns rise heavenwards, and testify to a nobler destiny. Jesus is the most lofty of these columns, which indicate to man, whence he has come, and whither he should direct his course." I have quoted these words from the "Life of Jesus" because they express a belief which is the antithesis of that founded on my text, and they bring out in sharp relief the views of a school which has certainly gained in number and in power, since the above-named book was written.

Was Christ Jesus only a man, or was He much more than a man? This is a question which has been asked, as we might expect, at divers times during the last eighteen centuries, but it has never been asked more persistently, never been answered less confidently, than in the present generation. I do not forget the almost endless variety of opinion and consequent disputes which characterized and sometimes debased Christendom in the earlier centuries of its history; but the point in debate then, in the majority of cases, was the nature of Christ's divinity. Now, however, it is doubted whether He was in any sense divine, other than that in which all good may be said to be of God.

What think ye of Christ? Son of Man only, or Son of God also? This is the question which in one form or other is being pressed on our generation. It is one to which, not a few nominally Christian, some even professedly Christian, return a very hesitating answer.

This has to a great extent arisen from the following causes. The immense advances made during the last half-century by every branch of science: the discovery in many quarters of a reign of law where all had seemed arbitrary: the extension of the sphere of the knowable, and the consequent retreat of that outer realm of mystery to a distance, sometimes so remote, that men are prone to forget its existence, have rendered them less ready to appeal to the supernatural, less willing to accept of anything which conflicts with the operation of law as ascertained by inductive processes. This unwillingness to give credence to anything which is contrary to experience, or incapable of being tested by experiment, has no doubt gained strength from the attitude assumed in the early days of scientific progress by the majority of the clergy and by many earnest laymen. Would-be defenders of the faith, whose zeal far exceeded their knowledge, have aroused by their rash onslaughts and ignorant vituperation a spirit distinctly hostile, and those who have formerly suffered from the clerical ban are not unwilling, now they have the power, to retort upon their former assailants.

But leaving the question of its causes, we have to deal with the fact that there is a growing reluctance to admit any element of miracle into the life of Jesus.

I wish, then, this afternoon to offer a few remarks on the relation in which the doctrine of the incarnation, as held by most Christian Churches, stands in regard to some views concerning human nature, which are entertained by many persons at the present day. In speaking of a subject, wide in itself and readily branching out, it is necessary to place some limits on the inquiry, to make some assumptions as the foundation of the argument.

Now in regard to this it is obvious that, putting aside discussions as to this or that miracle attributed to Christ in the New Testament, there are certain events in his own life—his conception and his resurrection among others—which, in the ordinary sense of the word, are miraculous: contrary to all experience: inexplicable by any known causes. If the miraculous is only another name for the impossible and the incredible, the question, of course, is at an end; this topic, however, I exclude to-day. I suppose myself addressing those, who are either sincere Christians or at any rate would not go so far as this, but would say that a miracle was most improbable and that mankind was very prone to regard as miraculous that which was simply surprising. To such as these I know that the statements of the Evangelists and other New Testament writers, as to the birth and the resurrection of Christ, present the gravest difficulties. These at least cannot be explained away; they are legend or they are truth; and men are timid in a scientific age of confessing that they believe in events so contrary to all experience.

The position, then, which I seek to maintain is this. Let us assume on the one hand that, without pressing the word in any exact theological sense, Jesus Christ came to lead men from darkness to light, to be in some way or other the means whereby they would attain to immortality

and happiness beyond the grave ; in short, that he was to the human race a Saviour and Deliverer. This doctrine was the keynote of the Apostles' message ; it has been taught ever since (even if sometimes modified by current opinion), by the universal Church on earth.

Let us also assume, on the other hand, that the evolution hypothesis is true in its most extreme form : viz., that not only the whole vegetable and animal world, in all its variety of structure and wealth of beauty, has sprung, in the course of long ages, by the operation of natural forces, from one, or at most a few, primordial germs, but also that the human race has not been exempt from this law, so that our pedigrees, could we trace them far enough back, would lead at last to an ancestry among the beasts that perish.

Suppose the researches of scientific men should ever compel us to accept the second of these assumptions, will it render impossible and incredible the first ? I maintain, as I hope to show, that it will make this more than ever probable —unless we are content to admit that for us, as for our ancestors, there is one and the same end. I assume, then, as I have implied, that a personal conscious immortality is possible, at any rate, to a part of the human race. Does man possess this in virtue of the nature which he has received from his brute ancestors, or from some other quarter? If by transmission from them, they also must have possessed it, and if they, how can we exclude the rest of the animal kingdom ? If man is immortal in consequence of his animal nature, I fail to see how we can deny this attribute to even the humblest forms of life, including perhaps even the vegetable world.

Not many, I presume, are prepared to make this admission. If, then, immortality is not inherent in man, regarded simply as a living creature, it must have been an addition to his nature ; for that the mortal could by its own effort become immortal, is contrary to the conclusions of science ; for instance, to such a one as the dissipation of energy. In short, immortality is an attribute called by simpler ages the gift of God, for which our own, so far as I am aware, has not succeeded in finding a better term.

If, then, we regard immortality in this light, as the result of an operation of the Spirit of God no the individual—when, where, how, for our present purpose matters not—the incarnation, as set forth in Christian doctrine, ceases to be an event so entirely without precedent. It is the result of a spiritual process similar in some respects to that which we believe numbers of men to have undergone. A faith in the latter change is not limited to Christians only. For centuries past, we know not for how many, the lips of men have uttered a cry of indignant protest against the doom of extinction ; their hearts have fostered a hope of, nay a belief in, another and an endless life. Unless you go outside human nature, unless you find the source of that life in something subject to other laws than those which prevail in the economy of this universe, there is no ground for any such belief, no reason for any such hope. Perchance, after the death of the body, the shade may for a time linger near its wonted haunts ; it may, for a time, enjoy the bliss of Elysian fields, or suffer in dungeons of Tartarus, but at last it must submit to the inevitable law of dissipation, and its end be nothingness.

This world of nature, as made known to us by science, offers no hope of immortality to man. It does not indeed exclude the possibility of a continuous life under other conditions, but it certainly supplies us with very few analogies, and its evidence is on the whole discouraging. An expectation of a personal immortality must be founded on something beyond nature, on a revelation of some kind, not on an induction from observed facts. Between these two opinions, it appears to me, there is no middle place. Exclude consistently the miraculous element from your belief, leave in your system no room for a revelation, hold no creed which is not founded on inductive reasoning, or at any rate is not inferred from analogies, and be content to accept the doom of nature in the fullest sense of the words, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

If, however, we insist that there is in ourselves and in almost the whole human race a belief in a personal immortality, so firmly implanted and so widely spread, that we must reckon with it as a fact in the world's order, explain its presence there as we may : if we admit of the possibility of a revelation—that is, a communication from an unknown power relating to the sphere of the extra-knowable : if we allow of, nay cling to, the possibility of a personal immortality, in itself so contradictory to all results of observation ; then, in our system of philosophy, we have made a place for the supernatural, the miraculous, and the acceptance of any alleged instance of the working of this becomes a question not of principle, but of degree.

Being, then, compelled either to give up all belief in a personal immortality, or to regard this as a divine gift, no necessary property of man, and so possibly not even bestowed upon all men, how far does the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation fall in with the analogies of the natural world? Is it hopelessly contradictory to them, or is it on the whole in harmony with them ? Assuming for a moment that the most extreme scientific views as to the origin of man are correct, and assuming that on such a creature the gift of immortality was to be disposed, is the Bible story of the mode of the Deliverer's birth antecedently credible or incredible ?

Men of science, holding the above-named views, will agree with theologians that the conscious heir of immortality has a moral nature far above that

of the beasts that perish. It is true that by the one a development of conscience is asserted, whereby the race through quasi-selective processes gradually rises in the moral scale; while by the other, the condition of man, unaffected by the deliverer, is regarded as the result of a degradation from a higher condition; still both will agree that between the animal man, who shares with some others among the beasts a certain embryonic consciousness of right and wrong, the result of education, and the man who has partaken of the quickening spirit, there is an immense gap, which no process of mere evolution or development can bridge. Both alike would admit that every effort of the human race in this direction had been a failure; that even among the best of men there was "none righteous, no not one." Yet the tendency of human thought, as well as the teaching of supposed revelation, supports the view that, if immortality is to be won by man alone, it can only be by the way of perfection. A deliverer, then, is needed. He must be sinless, or his example will not be perfect; he must be cast in human mould, or his example will not appeal to man. It would neither shame us nor encourage us to learn that beings of a different nature had resisted temptations, to which our own infirmities rendered us liable.

In the Deliverer, then, two apparently irreconcilable characteristics must be united; that of perfection and that of a liability to imperfection; an entire freedom from sin, and yet a true sympathy with sinners. This could only be by the subjection of the animal to the spiritual nature, so that the latter should, from the very first, neutralise everything which was pernicious in the former. The source of sin is listening to the call of the lower instead of the higher nature. In the Deliverer, then, the latter voice must always be the stronger. To take a rough illustration from chemistry—in man the higher and the lower natures form a combination which, at best, is very instable; in the Deliverer, they must be so combined as to be perfectly stable, with the hurtful property neutralised.

But, granting this, it may be asked, Why are we called upon to accept so astounding a statement concerning the birth of the Deliverer—that he was not born as other men, but of a Virgin Mother? I reply that, had he been born as other men, I do not understand how he could have been a Deliverer. If at some epoch of life the Spirit of God had descended upon him with such overmastering force as to lift his moral nature to a standard of absolute and enduring perfection, still there would have been an anterior period, though it might have been a brief one, during which the individual would not have fulfilled the law of perfectness, and thus the example of Christ would not have been a perfect one, the burden of humanity would not have been borne in its entirety. The whole significance of the incarnation, whether in its simpler or more theological aspect, consists in the perfect union, from the very first, of the two natures; yet if Christ had been born in the way of ordinary generation how could this have been? One of the principal results of scientific investigation, during late years, has been to establish what we may call the law of heredity as among the most potent which influence development. Men and races of men, animals and races of animals, are the outcome of two sets of forces; the one, external, the results of the environment, the other innate, originating, no doubt, in part from the environment of progenitors, but in part also from a principle which, even if it could be a consequence of environments in a very remote past, has become so essential a constituent of the inherited nature that it may be considered as inseparable from the latter, and thus as transmitted from individual to individual without sensible change. Hence the union of man and woman could only produce an offspring which would embody the natures of its ancestors. These might prevail in varied degrees, and be affected by the new combination, but the result would be a human being, however large might be the shares of excellencies, physical, intellectual or moral, which it might possess. Those "lofty columns" rising heavenwards above the dull level of humanity, mentioned in the passage which I quoted, are, after all, only the fortunate legatees of ancestral excellencies; instances, such as we sometimes see in everyday life, when through a chapter of accidents, as it apppears, the wealth of more than one family is concentrated in the hands of a single heir.

But, it may be urged, this argument only indicates the necessity of the union of the divine with the human from the earliest period at which the offspring possessed an individual life. There is, however, another consideration which we have to take into account; though, from the nature of the case, it is one difficult to discuss, so that I must in some respects suggest rather than elaborate the argument.

On the scientific hypothesis, which I have assumed as possible, the result of birth after the ordinary process is the transmission of the animal nature in all its completeness. Scientific men will express this in one way, theologians in another, but both will admit that by our birth we inherit what the latter term φρόνημα σαρκὸς, the "lust of the flesh," an "infection of nature." Yet from this the sinless Deliverer must be free. There must be in him a liability to all infirmity in human nature that is not in itself evil, but no sinful propensity.

Now, while the general effect of the moral growth of our race, and especially of the teaching of the New Testament, has been to ennoble marriage, and to invest it with a mystic significance and an almost sacramental import, it cannot be denied that it occupies no such position among the

great mass of heathen people, and was often held in low esteem even by those who had made, in pre-Christian days, considerable advances in civilization. It must also be admitted that ordinary births result from the satisfaction, however legitimate, of a desire, which has its foundation in a transmitted instinct and certainly may readily be degraded into a passion. Among the animal passions, it will be, I think, readily admitted that there are none more insidious, more destructive to the spiritual nature, than those which are placed in the forefront of the catalogue designated by the general term "the lusts of the flesh." These passions, and perhaps these alone, are not necessarily wholly excluded by a high degree of physical or even intellectual excellence. Temptations to sins which have their root in the completion of the organic structure of man and its ability to fulfil the conditions on which the existence of the race depends, may haunt even natures highly endowed with spiritual gifts. They are more subtle, more difficult to combat, more hard to avoid, than any temptations which arise from hunger, thirst, anger or the like. Yet they are universally admitted to bring us down, more readily than any other, to the level of the animals who in these matters know no sin. The bodily changes, which herald the liability to them, disturb, more than any other functional change, the balance of the individual, physical, intellectual, and moral; and in respect to them, more perhaps than any other sins, absolute innocence is impossible for human beings and a high standard cannot be reached without obtaining the knowledge of good and evil. It is probable also, though this it is difficult to prove, that trials of this nature are even severer to the man than to the woman, so that on the principle of heredity we may infer, that in this respect, the greater infection of nature is transmitted from the former side. Thus the birth of Christ from a pure Virgin, if once we admit the absolute necessity of a Deliverer, and so of some miraculous intervention, no longer seems the least probable mode of His introduction into the world, but on the contrary, the only way in which the apparently contradictory requirements of the case could be satisfied. On the one side the human nature was received in its best and purest form, while its inception was free from all possibility of taint, and like a new creation the direct act of the power of the Highest. As in the creation of living beings, the constituents of the inorganic world were endued with that principle, which we call life, so in this, the organism of man was quickened by the Spirit of God to form a new creature, and the deliverer of the old race was the firstborn of the new.

I have thus endeavoured to indicate to you that, unless we repudiate any idea of a scheme of salvation, the Christian belief, as to the incarnation of the Lord Jesus, is not rendered more improbable by the most advanced views as to the evolution of the human race, but is (as it seems to me) not only the most simple mode of fulfilling the conditions which had to be satisfied; but also the miracle, if we may presume to say it, which appears to have required the least expenditure of divine energy. If it be so, we shall do well to ask ourselves, we shall do well to ask others, "how long halt ye between two opinions?" Doubts and difficulties have produced at this epoch a large amount of half-hearted Christianity. Now I will go so far as to say that I personally expect, nay, am prepared to accept, considerable changes in what I may call the outworks of Christianity. I believe that some dogmas, once deemed important, may have to be modified or even abandoned; some controversies, once burning, be admitted to be a fighting over shadows. But I do not believe that you will ever find it possible to eject from Christianity the element of miracle, or to modify the main outlines of the historical and doctrinal teaching of the New Testament. The creed of Paul will have to be the creed of Christendom, otherwise, unless a new and true revelation come, we have no sure and certain hope beyond the grave. Viewed in the light of nature only, viewed in the light of science only, a future personal existence is most improbable, can at best be no more than a fond hope; it is by Christ, and Christ alone, that life and immortality have been brought to light in the gospel. On the one hand inflexible law is the only certainty, darkness and nothingness the only reasonable probability; on the other hand, there is the good shepherd, human in his sympathies, divine in his love and goodness and power, who, as the living truth, declares, "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." I can see no middle course between the path which leads me away into the gathering gloom of the outer darkness; and that which leads me to the light which streams from the risen and ascended Christ. Choose whichever seems to you the true one, but choose as those who recognise the full gravity, the eternal consequence of the issue, and do not flatter yourselves that it is light and trivial, or one on which there is no need to come to a decision. We have, in short, to choose between Christ the philanthropic philosopher, and Christ the Saviour of the world. I may leave these phrases, which I believe to be simple truth, to speak for themselves.

---

At Botley, Hants, a memorial window and a reredos of alabaster and various marbles have lately been placed in the parish church.

The Rev. John Macnaught, vicar of St. Mary's West Kensington, has addressed a letter to his congregation and parishioners announcing his resignation. The vicar explains that he feels no longer equal to the exertion of the charge of a large parish, and having had offered to him a small country benefice has accepted it.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 17, 1886.

## OUR NEW LEGISLATORS.

NOW that the British House of Commons has actually granted "leave" to Mr. Gladstone to bring in a Bill aimed, not merely at the peace and welfare, but at the very existence of the Empire, we propose briefly to examine some of the principles and doings of this, which is said to be "the best House of Commons that was ever known." In granting this perilous "leave" it is said that our representatives are actuated not by their own honest convictions, but by a blind and idolatrous confidence in a selfish, vain-glorious, and reckless politician, whose political course from first to last, and without a single exception, has been one of failure and accumulated misfortunes and disgrace to his country. Respect and deference to a political leader is an amiable and loyal trait, but it ought not to be exercised by representatives to the manifest injury of their constituents, and to the certain detriment of the State. It is admitted on all sides that this will be the result of the acceptance, even provisionally for a single hour, of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill—a measure for the abolition of all rule and government, and for the installation of one of the most cruel and lawless tyrannies that the world has ever witnessed. What are we to say of legislators who are led by the glamour of one man's eloquence and casuistry to accept a policy which contravenes the Divine ordinance that peace, happiness, and prosperity are strictly conditional on the observance of law and order? Professor Huxley truly writes :—

> It is the electorate, and chiefly the Liberal majority, which is responsible. It confounds Party warfare with politics. It believes in shibboleths and sentimental *blague*, and is too grossly ignorant of the elements of political science to have anything worth calling a conviction outside parochial and trade questions. Hence it falls a ready prey to every copious fallacy-monger who appeals to its great heart instead of reminding it of its weak head. Politicians have gone on flattering and cajoling this chaos of political incompetence until the just penalty of believing in their own fictions has befallen them, and the average member of Parliament is conscientiously convinced that it is his duty not to act for his constituents to the best of his judgment, but to do exactly what they (or, rather, the small minority which drives them) tell him to do. Have we a real statesman? Is there among us a man of the calibre of Pitt or Burke, to say nothing of Strafford or Pym, who will stand up and tell his countrymen that this disruption of the Union is nothing but a cowardly wickedness, an act base in itself, and fraught with immeasurable evil, especially to the people of Ireland; and that if it cost his political existence, or his head for that matter, he is prepared to take any and every honest means of preventing the mischief? I see no signs of any. And if such a man should come to the front, what chance is there of his receiving loyal and continuous support from a majority in the House of Commons? I see no signs of any.

Last week we alluded to the immoral, un-Christian, and injurious action of the House of Commons in repealing, at Mr. Stansfield's instance, the C. D. Acts. In reply to a personal inquiry why the new House was not divided on this important subject, so that the constituencies might distinguish the sheep from the goats, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck writes :—

> I would willingly have divided the House last Friday night, but found that I could get no one except Sir R. Peel and a very few others to go with me. All the occupants of the *front Opposition Bench* walked out, so you will perceive that the "sheep" were left in a hopeless minority.

How few are the truly wise and Christian legislators on this vital question! On the 2nd of April the Intoxicating Liquors (Sale to Children) Bill was read a second time by 132 against 115 in the House of Commons. It provides that any publican who sells liquor to children under the age of thirteen shall be summoned and fined, and was carried by the votes of the most radical and advanced members, who proclaim their enthusiastic belief in the intelligence and conscientiousness rectitude of the great democracy. Yet what is involved in their vote? That they believe the masses of their own constituencies to be mental babes. They tell us that "the working classes" want this Bill; that they know the dreadful results of sending children for beer; but that they are such weaklings that they are sure to commit the offence, unless somebody other than themselves is compelled under penalty to prevent it. The workman knows what is right, but owing to his infirmity of character he yields to indolence and evil—sends his innocent, tender, and unsophisticated child out for the family beer, instead of going himself to the public house (and staying there); and now he wants a good, kind, grandmotherly House of Commons to step in and make it impossible, by fining not the honest, though mentally weak, son of toil, but the publican. In brief, the "new Radical members" think the working man a fool, and qualifying himself for a slave.

---

WE are requested by the Rev. J. M. Wilson to state that there is no foundation for the report that has found its way into the papers, that the Bishop of London had offered him the living of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. It is due to the Bishop, and to Mr. Kitto, the new rector of St. Martin's, that this should be made known.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### FREE TRADE.

SIR,—Your correspondents "B." and "H. W." will probably expect some answer to their arguments and assertions on the subject of so-called Free Trade. I suppose they will both be perfectly ready to admit that we have at present only free imports on many goods, but no free trade at all, because all foreign civilised countries, without exception, are Protectionist on principle, with a view to forwarding the interests of home production. Yet in spite of this universal practical "consensus" against Free Trade, "B." maintains that "the fundamental doctrine of Free Trade is all but universally accepted," unrestricted competition. He is mistaken. The very theory is regarded as "exploded," by the majority of living political economists, more especially by those of Germany. But this is a secondary consideration. The practical conclusion of all foreign statesmen and communities is the establishment of Protection in the interest of home producers. I must be allowed to go briefly to the bottom of this question, appealing to first principles and reason far rather than to supposed authority.

When it is contended, then, that "a condition of unrestrained freedom in production and in exchange is that under which production results in the greatest amount of wealth," an opinion is advanced which is opposed to all experience, British and foreign, and to the essential nature of things. Action on such a principle is tantamount to a complete surrender of all the rights and interests of labour, and to the highest interests of a nation. Unrestricted competition among all nations in the production of cheap goods would mean a perpetual internecine struggle among nations to undersell one another at the cost of labour. Other things being equal, that nation would conquer in this strife which obtained the largest amount of work from its working classes for the least possible amount of pay, and so the triumph of unrestricted competition would be to reduce labour to a state of serfdom. The hopelessly fallacious character of this really exploded system is confessed practically by "B." when he says that the time when our mines shall come to be exhausted is a question for engineers, "not for economists." According to this mock-science, political economy has nothing to do with a nation's real or lasting health and wealth (which in the long-run, I may observe, will go together), but has only to consider the value of exchanges for the time being. This is the fundamental error in the reasoning of Adam Smith, who practically overlooks the necessity of production, and the plain fact that the wealth of a country depends on the employment of all its productive energies of whatever kind. Exchange, we must be never tired of repeating, comes only in the second place. The primary interest of every country is production, and, as far as possible, healthful production, or production under healthful conditions, which secure, as far as may be, constant employment and fair wages to the labouring classes. To this end, it is essential that the markets of a country be not flooded with the products of foreign labour, crowding out and rendering useless similar products of home labour. Goods which are not produced in a country may enter its ports and harbours wholly free from Customs duties as far as the interests of home production are concerned. Here and thus far free trade may be established with other lands on terms of mutual advantage. But unrestricted competition with all lands in the chief staples of home production means the reduction of profit to the lowest possible limit, at the expense of capital invested in production, and of native labour.

I have already said that I am satisfied, with List and other economists, that Adam Smith was altogether wrong in principle, in ignoring the interests of labour and those of separate nations; but it is true, as I before remarked, that he made a special exception in the interest of agricultural produce, maintaining that as agriculture was the healthiest and most essential of all occupations, no nation could sacrifice its agricultural interests. At that time, however, the costs of transport were so great as to constitute a strong natural protection, and, as a matter of fact, a fair average price for corn was maintained up to the year 1870—about 60s. a quarter. This has now declined to 30s., partly because the costs of transport have become almost nominal, partly because a much larger area of land has been brought into cultivation for the growing of wheat in America, India, and other lands. The result is absolute ruin to the British farmer and agricultural labourer. In the last fifteen years fully a million and a quarter acres have gone out of wheat-cultivation, and the agricultural population has been reduced by considerably upwards of a million, and the process of ruin is now frightfully accelerated—the rapids near an agricultural Niagara.

"B." and "H. W." are able to persuade themselves that all this is done in the interest of labour, as securing a cheap loaf. The result of the late Manchester elections, and Mr. Howorth's unanswerable letters in the *Times* ought to have opened their eyes. Even Mr. Chamberlain could tell them that the exodus of agricultural labour from the country to the towns and cities has brought down the rate of wages in the latter, and done fearful mischief. The home-market, too, for manufactures is grievously impaired. Ruined agriculturists cannot buy. There is a fearful loss of capital involved in the ruin of the agricultural interest to the whole country.

But a false theory has taken possession of the minds of "B." and "H. W.," and renders them, I fear, impervious to reason or fact. Once for all, they believe in the divine character of money cheapness, and consider the supposed interest of "Consumers," without remembering that a country can only consume on the condition of producing first, and can only continue to consume in the ratio of its productive power. As far as the mischief of unlimited competition with the world affects other countries also, profits must be everywhere reduced, and the interests of labour sacrificed; but where a Protectionist policy is boldly enforced, as in the United States, a far better state of things prevails. Home competition within the limits of a country, all of whose citizens are liable to the same demands and subject to the same limitations, is healthful and desirable, as stimulating energy and industry; it is unrestricted competition with the whole world which is fatal and destructive. Again, an Imperial Customs' House for Britain and her Colonies would be feasible; not absolutely free exchange, for this, too, would be fatal to home agriculture, but by way of differential duties. But the all-important

matter to establish is that unrestricted competition is an accursed and anti-Christian principle, necessarily fatal in the long run to any country or community that adopts it.

I must add that the old *laissez-faire* and *laissez-aller* argument put forward by your correspondents and by all free traders is utterly and obviously fallacious. It is not at all true that the individual's interests are always identical with those of the community. The very reverse is constantly the truth. The individual considers only his own identical loss and gain for the time being. A community, or nation, or State, must look before and after, and consider the permanent benefit or injury to the productive interests and prosperity of the nation. A State is a community with common interests and duties, not a mere "congeries" of units. This, again, is one of the grossest errors of the exploded political economy of the last century, which cannot be too earnestly repudiated by all thinking men.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
April 10, 1886.

---

SIR,—I said in my letter of the 4th April, that I would, with your permission, quote some authoritative statistics in support of my contention that the working classes have much improved in condition since the establishment of Free Trade. I have gleaned the following from Mr. Giffen's inaugural address as President of the Statistical Society, delivered 20th November, 1883. No higher authority exists. I have condensed as much as possible the information there given. In a table headed "Comparison of wages fifty years ago and at the present time" (1883) he gives the wages, for the two periods, of thirteen different classes of people, employed either in Glasgow, Manchester, Huddersfield, Bradford, or Staffordshire, and in each case the later date shows a large increase upon the earlier one, the average increase being no less than 73 per cent. In another table he gives a comparison of seaman's wages, as paid in Bristol, Glasgow, Liverpool and London, in 1850 and 1883. This table again shows an average increase, at the later date, of 52½ per cent. In the absence of official returns as to the agricultural labourers he had to gather information from independent sources—the Reports of the Royal Agricultural Commission, Sir James Caird and others—and on the authority of these he estimates the rise at about 60 per cent. over what was paid just before the repeal of the corn laws. With reference to all descriptions of labour, he adds that "While the money wages have increased the hours of labour have diminished," and he thinks to an extent of nearly 20 per cent. "There has been at least this reduction in the textile, engineering, and house-building trades. The workman gets from 50 to 100 per cent. more money, for 20 per cent. less work; in round figures he has gained from 70 to 120 per cent. in fifty years in money return."

So much may suffice for information as to wages; now as to the cost of living. On this, he observes, "The conclusion is that taking things in the mass, the sovereign goes as far as it did forty and fifty years ago, while there are many new things in existence at a low price which could not then have been bought at all. If in the interval the average money earnings of the working man have risen from 50 to 100 per cent. there must have been an enormous change for the better in the means of the working man, unless by some wonderful accident it has happened that his special articles have changed in a different way from the general run of prices. But looking to special articles, we find that on balance, prices are lower and not higher. Take wheat—it is notorious that wheat, the staff of life, has been lower, on the average, of late years, than it was before the Free Trade era." He then contends that the violent fluctuations of price of the prime necessities of life which formerly existed, were specially disastrous to the working man; they were fluctuations which at times implied "sheer starvation." These fluctuations have practically ceased for the last twenty-five years.

With regard to other leading articles of consumption he says, "It may be stated broadly that while sugar and such articles have declined largely in price, and while clothing is cheaper, the only article interesting the workman much which has increased in price is meat, the increase here being considerable. The truth is, however, that meat fifty years ago was not an article of the working man's diet as it has since become. He had little more concern with its price than with the price of diamonds. The kind of meat which was mainly accessible to the working man fifty years ago, bacon, has not increased sensibly in price. House rent in the aggregate cannot have gone up in a way to neutralise to any serious extent the great rise in the money wages of the workman. On the whole he estimates that after payment of rent, the workman has now a balance for other purposes of something more than 80 per cent. more than he had fifty years ago. As to rent, he says, "Houses are undoubtedly of better value all round than they were fifty years ago." They are better houses, and even now "on the five million families at least of the working classes in Great Britain the sum would come only to about £7 per family, which is not the main portion of an average working man's expenditure." He adds, "We return then to the conclusion that the increase of the money wages of the working man in the last fifty years corresponds to a real gain. While his wages have advanced, most articles he consumes have rather diminished in price, the change in wheat being especially remarkable, and significant of a complete revolution in the condition of the masses."

He gives in addition the following advantages that the present working man possesses:—education, postal accommodation, inspection of factories, sanitary inspection, free libraries, etc., etc, which, as he justly says, if they do not give food or clothing, make life sweeter and better to him. Statistics of various kinds justify the conclusion that the masses are better off than formerly. The evidence is cumulative, a point of material importance in all such inquiries. Amongst others, and of special value, are those relating to length of life. In his able paper on the "Recent Decline in the English Death-rate," Mr. Humphreys showed conclusively that the decline in the death-rate in the five years, 1876 to 1880, as compared with the period of 1838 to 1854, raised the mean duration of life amongst males from 39·9 to 41·9, and amongst females from 41·9 to 45·3, a gain of nearly 3½ years in the average duration of life.

Now this means that on the whole the masses have been healthier, and have suffered less from sickness than they did. The statistics of the consumption of the principal articles of food point decisively in the same direction. To quote two only—the consumption of tea and sugar is now four times as much per head

as it was forty years ago. Again, pauperism has lessened, and crime, so often the offspring of destitution and ignorance, has lessened too, and that in no trifling degree. Yet again, the number of the working classes who have been able to store up some small degree of wealth has enormously increased, as the following table of savings' bank deposits shows :—

| | 1831. | 1881. |
|---|---|---|
| Number of Depositors ... ... | 429,000 | 4,140,000 |
| Amount of Deposits ... ... ... | £13,719,000 | £80,334,000 |
| Amount per Depositor ... ... | £32 | £19 |

And that is not all, for the industrial and provident co-operative societies furnish another and readily available means for the safe investment of the small capital moneys of the working man.

The above is a sample of the evidence which the scientific analysis of experts affords us as to what has been the condition of the working man till quite recently, and our own observation entirely confirms it. I need go no further to show that the improvement in that condition during the last forty years has been very great and very gratifying.

I am not asserting that the whole of this improvement has been due to Free Trade, but it has at least originated and culminated within the Free Trade period, and the rational inference, in the absence of conflicting evidence, is that Free Trade has exercised a favourable influence. But at least it cannot, with sanity, be regarded as the *bête noire* which some excitable people imagine it to be. So far as its influence can positively be traced, it has been entirely beneficial to the masses. That there has been improvement in the condition of the industrial population in most civilised countries, although protectionist, does not militate against this ; for so far as the old countries are concerned, the improvement has not equalled that in Great Britain ; on the other hand the new countries possess in their virgin soil a mine of wealth, which, with reasonable fiscal arrangements, shall enable them to distance all competitors. Both old and new countries are now alike suffering from depression. We know only too well what has recently occurred in Belgium. The Toronto *Evening News* of March 11 contains a letter complaining of the distressed condition of the working classes in Canada, and advocating short hours as a partial remedy. At an important meeting held in Paris about the middle of March, Protection was denounced as the origin of the sufferings of the French population ; and it is only too notorious that, in spite of the low wages and long hours which enable the Continental nations at present to undersell us, there is a large amount of distress among them from slackness of trade.

Anything that may be asserted to the contrary, notwithstanding, this depression is not confined to Great Britain or the continent of Europe, but is experienced over a very wide area, and its origin is to a large extent shrouded in obscurity.

H. W.

April 10, 1886.

P.S.—I have read with pleasure the letter from "B." in your paper of this day.

---

SIR,—May I suggest to your correspondent "B." that he explain the "essential economical conceptions" wherewith we must be "possessed" in order "to understand thoroughly" what Free Trade—rather the "points about it are." We might learn them !

The doctrine is "that a condition of unrestrained freedom in production and in exchange is that under which production results in the greatest amount of wealth." This is very pretty, but is it practicable ? Does the position obtain anywhere ? Can it obtain ? Echo answers, Can it ? A prior question to Free Trade is that of taxes. Can we do without taxes ? The question answers itself. And till we can do without taxes, we cannot have a condition of unrestrained freedom. As matters stand, however, we handicap the home produce, and we make the course free and easy for the foreigner. Is this fair ? I was about using a stronger expression, but I refrain. I do not consider the other aspects of the case ; this suffices.

May I ask again that your correspondent say where Prince Bismarck's reasoning is at fault ? It is no proof to say so. It is very curious that the system, carried out as it is by the Germans, does not put a stop to trade in Germany. Last year I spent a very considerable time in a German manufacturing town, and I found that the operatives were in full work —this is far from the case here—not only where the goods were wanted and taxes had not to be paid, but also where they had to be paid. Facts are better than fancies. Taxes do not stop trade, and cannot stop it, so long as there is demand. I hope "B" will forgive me when I say that he does not make his meaning clear in the last sentence in the third paragraph, and so I do not know what to make of it.

When I said "trade increased in spite of and not in consequence of Free Trade, I meant what I said, viz., that trade would have increased in any case. Other conditions warranted this. The inference "B" draws is absurd. Free trade gives all the work to the foreigner, and takes the bread out of the home producer's mouth. Your correspondent promised to answer the question, "Why is trade so bad now, seeing that Free Trade means good trade?" but forgot to do so. I fear the task will be no easy one.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, April 10th, 1886.

---

## THE BLACK RUBRIC.

SIR,—Allow me to assure "Erigena" that in my letter about Transubstantiation, I had no thought at all in the direction of reconciling the Black Rubric with that affirmation of Roman dogma. My sole purpose was to point out that the dogma is not correctly stated when it is put in the form of an assertion that the bread and wine are changed into the natural Body and Blood of Christ.

As to the Rubric, it is important to remember that its object was not to deny transubstantiation dogmatically, but to reconcile the Puritans to communicating in a kneeling posture. As the Romanists kneel before the Host in adoration, the scrupulous Puritans not very unnaturally thought that *our* kneeling might be taken to savour of the same intent, and thus might minister to superstition. The Rubric, therefore, asserts the Anglican kneeling to be merely a posture of reverent and grateful acknowledgement of the divine goodness ; and adds two reasons why on Anglican principles it could not be anything more. If it were an adoration of the Sacrament, it must be offered either to the elements, or to an adorable presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood in the elements. It could not be the former, because the Anglican doctrine holds the elements to remain unchanged, and to be therefore incapable of being

worshipped without gross idolatry. Nor could it be the latter, for according to Anglican doctrine the natural Body of Christ is in heaven, and cannot be at once in more places than one, and therefore cannot be present in the Sacrament to be worshipped there. Hence on Anglican principles there is nothing in the Sacrament that can be worshipped, and the prescribed kneeling cannot be a posture of adoration.

Such I imagine to be the plain purport of the Rubric. Comparing it with the Roman dogma, I should say that it contradicts the dogma in two ways; one direct and explicit, the other indirect and implicit. When it asserts that "the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances," it absolutely contradicts the dogma of transubstantiation. But there is no direct contradiction when it affirms that in the Sacrament there is no "corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood," or no presence of "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ," which it uses as equivalent expressions. For although the Roman dogma holds the entire Christ to be as really present on the altar in the Sacrament as He is in heaven, it does not affirm His presence to be after the same manner, or to be in the Sacrament a *natural* presence. Hence, taking the phraseology of the Rubric by itself, the plea might be urged with some degree of plausibility, that the presence excluded and denied by the Rubric is not the same as the presence affirmed by the Roman dogma. There is, however, something to be taken into account, besides the loose, popular terms in question. The obvious *intention* of the Rubric is to argue that kneeling at the Communion cannot be prescribed as an act of adoration of the Sacrament, *because there is nothing in the Sacrament which is proper to be adored.* This necessarily implies the denial of *every kind* of adorable presence of Christ in the Sacraments or elements, and therefore contradicts the Roman dogma, which affirms one particular kind of such presence.

I am not sure that I quite follow "*Erigena*" in the latter paragraph of his letter. What I meant is that physical science knows nothing of matter except its perceptible qualities, which are in fact the "accidents" of the schoolmen, of a supersensible substance destitute of any cognisable properties it is absolutely ignorant. Physical science, in fact, is phenomenal, not ontological; if it sometimes suggests that matter is an aggregation of centres of force, or that atoms are but vortices whirling in an imponderable elastic ether, these are but guesses which overleap its proper boundaries. Even to the question of the "objective existence of an external world" it can give no answer; it can satisfy itself either with idealism or materialism, —with Berkeleyism or Lockism.

For my own part, "*Erigena*" is right in thinking that I am no Berkeleian; but I do not feel the need of the School-doctrine of substance to keep me from falling a victim to that delightful philosopher's paradox. It is enough for me to rest upon the two primary affirmations of human consciousness, "I am," and "The external world is." If I cannot trust these, I can trust nothing. It is either these, or absolute Pyrrhonism. The rapid descent from Locke to Hume shows this amusingly. The first sets aside the consciousness as a factor of knowledge, treats the mind as a blank tablet on which sensation writes, and supposes all knowledge to be but a classification and interpretation of the written characters. Then Berkeley examines this process, and soon perceives that sensation is the primary fact, and that Locke's assumption of an external world to produce the sensations is a mere makeshift, at variance with his fundamental principles. So, instead of that assumption, Berkeley's theological instinct proposes another, viz., that all sensations are produced by the direct action of God on every mind; and of course an external world becomes a superfluity. Lastly comes Hume, and chuckles over the discovery that Berkeley has only half carried out his principle, and that it is just as good against the mind itself, as it is against matter. If sensation cannot give an external world, neither can it give a permanent *ego;* intermittent flashes of sensation is the sole residuum of the sense-philosophy. From that result there is no escape except by trusting to the consciousness which tells us that we are, and the world is. With that consciousness I am satisfied.

PRESBYTER.

## IS SILENCE AN EFFECTIVE CORRECTOR OF ERROR?

SIR,—I will endeavour, in reply to "J. B.," to state my reasons for not preaching "the larger hope," briefly, but a little more clearly.

I gather from "J. B.'s" letter that he is a layman, and if I am right in my conjecture, I will ask him to think over the great difference between the position of a clergyman in the pulpit and of a layman talking amongst friends. A clergyman addresses a congregation, some young, some old, a few well educated, and a majority half, and less than half, educated, a very few thoughtful and earnest, and very many careless and indifferent, needing therefore constant rousing. All these listen, or rather *half* listen, to the same sermon; and as I know by experience, are very likely, unless the words be well chosen, clear, and simple, to mistake the preacher's meaning altogether. Hence I said, and say again, that the doctrine of the larger hope, unless very carefully handled, is an exceedingly dangerous doctrine—dangerous, I mean, not for the thoughtful few, but for the careless many.

Again, I think by being carefully Scriptural, it is quite possible to preach that punishment necessarily follows on sin, and must follow; without falling into the opposite error of ascribing "barbarities of endless duration to the Ruler of the Universe, who is also the Creator, and is the Sustainer of all life, in whom we live and move and have our being; who is, moreover, declared to be essentially, permanently, unalterably light and love." I quote "J. B.'s" words, because I am not a party-evangelical, and know quite well the enormous harm that has been done by this party in years gone by. But surely it is possible to avoid "the falsehood of extremes;" Holy Scripture speaks most clearly of the consequences of sin. "Be not deceived," says St. Paul, "God is not mocked, whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap," and it is surely possible (say, rather, most necessary) to preach this without additions or limitations of any kind.

Again, I would ask "J. B." not to conclude that because I do not preach a doctrine, therefore I never teach it. Many doctrines are, or may be, true, which nevertheless should not be proclaimed from the pulpit. I hold (though of course I may be mistaken) the Mosaic authorship of parts of the Pentateuch doubtful, and more than doubtful; I hold that the LXX. often gives a better text than the received Hebrew; would "J. B." have me expound either of these opinions from the pulpit? Yet almost all scholars would agree with

the former statement, and some with the latter,—that does not therefore make them suitable for pulpit exposition. A clergyman has by parochial visiting, by classes, and by other similar means, opportunities which a layman has not ; of explaining to individuals difficulties which they may feel ; and these opportunities I have often used, and I hope always shall use. Many a time, at bible classes and while visiting, have I been questioned by my parishioners on this and similar subjects, and *then* I have not hesitated to speak freely ; *then* the larger hope should be taught, but from the pulpit, I still think it should not.

As a reviewer, I heartily recommend Dr. Cox's sermons to your readers, but I felt bound to state that Dr. Cox was preaching one doctrine to the exclusion of another equally true ; not criticising in any unfriendly spirit, but, I hope, courteously. And so also I reply to "J. B."

YOUR REVIEWER.

## THE LARGER HOPE.

SIR,—Some time ago I addressed to you more than one letter on the opinion of late gaining ground amongst theologians, that evil will be finally annihilated at "the restoration of all things." I do not wish to renew, at present, discussion of that subject. But I wish to express myself as in agreement with your correspondent "J. B.," who deprecates silence concerning it ; and this, although I differ from him, both in his apprehension of the doctrine, and in acceptance of it. I think that to call a doctrine "dangerous," because one fears its effects, or *tendencies* (to use a word I do not like), on men's minds, and on their morals, when one believes that doctrine, is evidence of want of faith and confidence in truth. These are things, matters of high and deep truth, which it is not judicious to open frequently or systematically to the vulgar ; because the vulgar do not appreciate them, and would probably misapprehend them without a more lucid exposition than most men are able to make of recondite things. The subject of what the destiny of men in the next life, as revealed in the Bible, will be, is not one of these. If a man has a conviction on the subject, of that nature that it is bound up in his mind with all his convictions, and if it forms, as it were, part of his faith, I cannot see that it is not his duty to show others his reasons for his opinion. I am quite sure, that, supposing his conviction to be strong, and satisfying to his own spirit as well as mind, it will do his moral nature harm to be esoteric respecting it.

My own belief on the matter is, that, seeing men to be endowed with freedom of choice between good and evil, it is a logical, an almost mathematical contradiction, in terms that the existence of evil, which is in all forms a disturbance of Divine order, and therefore an opposition to Divine purpose, should ever cease to be possible ; and that if it cannot cease to be possible, its extermination is impossible. In other words, that freedom of choice between two things supposes, nay involves, the being of both. I do not accept the promise in the Scriptures, of the restoration of all things, as any promise that evil, as such, will be extinguished ; but as a promise that those things which have in this state of being opposed the Divine purpose, will be brought into conformity with it ; while owing to their liability from their own liberty, and consequent imperfection, however perfectible, to err, that conformity will be subject to degree.

I do not believe in the Hell of Dante, and of the Paradise Lost ; nor in the imposition of punishment, be it as discipline or as retribution, by the Almighty Father of mankind, without a purpose. Those who teach the now revived doctrine of "the larger hope" —it is not new, it is a reproduction—often impeach the true doctrine (as I think), of eternal punishment or perdition as if it were, and must be, but an adaptation from the heathen and mediæval notions of Gehenna. No advocacy really gains by attacking what the advocate opposes with misrepresentation. To attack an opinion which is at least tenable, by always representing it in caricature, and by treating the caricature as the universal and only accepted dogma, will make converts only at first, and those converts the least valuable. I am accordingly unwilling to allow your correspondent's observations to pass without notice ; agreeing, while I differ here, in his objection to silence.

Dogma, as understood, is not properly to be objected to. Of course, as all know, *a dogma* only means an opinion ; that is, primarily. It has come to mean an authoritative and generally condensed expression of an opinion. Men, after reasoning on matters of question, naturally fall into the use of such expressions of their conclusions. It is no objection to the use of such, which are almost necessary in expositions of science and of thought, that they may be abused by substituting the expression of the opinion for the opinion itself. Even if language never changed from age to age in its meaning, no doctrine is so capable of being crystallised as never to be necessary to be opened up and re-examined. For the understanding of what men thought in the old time, if for nothing else, dogmas are useful.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

April 10th, 1886.

## ST. PAUL THE AUTHOR OF THE ACTS AND THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—The "fatal tactics" of Mr. Heber Evans, as Dr. Plummer rightly calls them in his letter of the 4th inst., are, to quote from a great speech lately delivered in Parliament, "the motor muscle" of his work. They are manifest from the tone of the letters in Vol. I., and from the subjoined extracts. Dr. Plummer will see that his epithet is not misapplied. (Letter i., p. 18.) "You will see, therefore, that I am not wasting labour on a needless task in proposing to establish this point in opposition to Strauss and Zeller ; and in endeavouring to prove even more than this, viz., that *St. Paul was the true author of the Third Gospel* and of the Acts," etc. Again (Letter vii., Results, p. 69) : "Thus a firm *πού στῶ*, a solid *point d'appui*, is at once gained as the result of these researches for the solution of what Prof. Sanday calls 'one of the *most difficult* problems of New Testament criticism, that which is concerned with the origin and composition of the Synoptic Gospels.' . . . The disciples of Strauss, *et hoc genus omne*, can no longer echo their Master's words. . . . *The chief positions are at once* OVERTHROWN *for which the sceptics have contended*, who have made such persistent and fierce attacks upon the Gospels during the century." The italics and capital letters are the author's own. Mr.

Heber Evans fails to see what struck your correspondent at once, that under cover of the best intentions he is playing into his adversaries' hands. Such "fatal tactics" should be firmly withstood.

Respecting Dr. Hobart's book on the "Medical Language of St. Luke," your reviewer is closely engaged in a comparative study of the surviving writings of the Greek medical school, the LXX., the N. T., Josephus, Philo, etc. It has already yielded interesting results, and he hopes, when complete, to submit them to the judgment of those interested in Biblical exegesis. At present it would be premature o say more than that they will certainly enlarge the scope and probably modify the results of Dr. Hobart's book.

YOUR REVIEWER.

---

SIR,—While thanking you for the interesting and instructive notice of my work on the authorship of the Acts, which appeared in your issue of April 3rd, will you permit me to say that the learned reviewer, as it seems to me, somewhat misses the point of the argument?

"Paul's verbal peculiarities are not Paul." Quite so. But if, in addition to Paul's verbal peculiarities counted, not by scores, but by hundreds, there are found Paul's grammatical peculiarities, Paul's favourite metaphors, and other striking and characteristic figures of speech, Paul's doctrinal views (which are not contained in Matthew or Mark), and Paul's personal history, from the subjective point of view very minutely detailed, which latter is so selected and presented to the reader as to form a most admirable defence of Paul's great life-work—then there seems good reason for asserting that we have here not only Paul's peculiarities, but also Paul himself. The Third Gospel and the Acts are not "Reminiscences" or "Memorials" of a dead Apostle, but an "*Apologia pro vitâ suâ*" put forth by the most remarkable man, take him for all in all, who ever lived. This document was meant to be a potent factor in making the history of St. Paul's own times, and would have been a sad anachronism in the second century, or at any period after St. Paul's martyrdom in A D. 64.

There are other points on which I should have liked to say a word, but I must not trespass on your space, nor must one too lightly disregard that infallibility "which doth hedge" a critic more even than a pope. My critic, however, seems to forget that the authenticity of the First Epistle to St. Peter has been questioned for the very reason (as Alford mentions) that its thoughts and expressions are too like those of St. Paul, etc.

I cannot help asking, also, if the authorship of "Undesigned Coincidences" should not be attributed to Professor Blunt rather than to Paley?

As to *vis inertiæ*, were we to desist because of it, all reforms would be barred, all progress stayed. And as to revolution, one revolution at least proved to be a glorious revolution. All this is no argument, except as far as it encourages laziness. It is always easier to swim with the stream, and, parrot-like, to keep on chiming in with the time-honoured "mumpsimus." Does my critic wish to reproduce in these days those Brothers of Ignorance, of whom Luther says that they knew nothing, and took an oath to learn nothing?

I take some comfort from a sentence in a letter addressed to me by a well-known London clergyman, himself an author, "As far as I can judge, you stand in a fair way of carrying general conviction, and that before long," and good old Wycliffe's saying still possesses some vitality: "I trowe that in the ende the truth will conquere."

I do not contradict the commonly-received tradition. I simply interpret it, and with the early Christian Fathers and others, give it a fuller, deeper meaning. As a Gentile Luke could not have been the author of the Acts, which are clearly the work of a Jew. But Luke may have been the amanuensis of St. Paul.

H. HEBER EVANS.

April 13, 1886.

---

## THE IRISH CHURCH.

SIR,—I have no wish to prolong a controversy with "C. C., V.-G." I can only say my experience of the Irish Church has been much happier than his. I have not met the "farmers" (whom he has found so abundant) either in General or Diocesan Synods or Parochial Vestries. Although the Laity are two to one, it must be remembered that in the General Synod the Bishops can sit and vote as a separate house when they please, and as a rule the Clergy attend Synods much more regularly, and vote more solidly, than the Laity. On the second day of a Diocesan Synod the Laity are nearly all absent—this I have often observed. As regards men signing declarations of Church membership in a dishonest spirit, I don't see how the Church can be blamed for that. She provides the proper forms, and if dishonest men sign them in a dishonest sense, the shame and the blame are theirs, not hers. Mr. Bradlaugh has at last taken the oath. If the Irish Church escapes the fresh evil designs of her persistent enemy, Gladstone, as please God she will, she will have no reason to be ashamed of the record of the disestablished career which he forced upon her.

AN IRISH CHURCHMAN.

---

# Reviews and Notices.

"THE DIACONATE OF WOMEN IN THE ANGLICAN CHURCH." Five Chapters on the Present Attitude of the Question. By the Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., late Dean of Chester, with a short Biographical Sketch by his Son. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1886. Pp. 94.

THIS interesting little volume is divided into five chapters, all treating on the subject of the Church Ministry of women. The first chapter treats on the biblical aspects of the Ministry of women, and is an address delivered at a meeting of deaconesses in Farnham Castle, on the 26th day of July, 1883. The second is on "Deaconesses," a paper read at the Church Congress held in Reading, October, 1883. The third on the Church Ministry of Women, a speech in Convocation at York, on July 16th, 1884. The fourth on the Primitive Diaconate of Women, being Appendix I of the report of the Church Ministry of Women, presented to Convocation at York, on the 22nd of April, 1885, and the last is a speech in Convocation at York, April 23rd, 1885, on presenting the report on the Church Ministry of Women, &c. Most of our

readers will feel more or less interested in the subject of women's work in the Church of Christ, and we recommend this little book to their notice.

FOR the additions and alterations which are proposed to be made at the Bishop's palace, adjoining Lincoln minster, tenders have been received varying from £11,745 to £8,640.

AT Hereford Cathedral the arrangements for Holy Week include sermons on the first six days by Canon Hole, of Caunton. On Good Friday the latter part of the Commination Service will afterwards be chanted. On Easter Eve, at 4.30, the anthem will consist of a selection from the "Messiah." Dean Herbert will preach on Easter Day.

A COMMISSION appointed by the Archbishop to consider the best means of rearranging and augmenting the revenues of the benefices at Canterbury has drawn up a report which on Friday was submitted to a public meeting. The only objection was stated to be one raised by the parishioners of St. Andrew's and St. Mary Bredman, who are desirous of being annexed to St. Margaret rather than to St. George the Martyr. A resolution was unanimously passed in support of this application, it being recommended that the living of St. George should be augmented by some other means. One of the suggestions of the commission as to the means of raising additional funds was the suppression of a stall at the cathedral.

ON Wednesday, the 7th inst., two more sales under distraint for extraordinary tithe took place at Ticehurst, Sussex, by order of the Vicar, the Rev. Arthur Eden. The first occurred at the homestead on Cottonden Farm, in the occupation of Mr. Isaac Hoadley, one of the largest and most influential farmers of the district. A stack of oats, containing nearly a hundred quarters, and a rick of hay were here offered, and both bought in in the interest of the distrained farmer. The other sale was at Mr. Alexander Vine's, on Cooper's Farm. Here also a large rick of hay was offered, and bought in as before. At this sale the vicar caused a second distress to be levied, for the same amount, not having recovered sufficient at his first seizure in October last, although ample property was distrained upon.

ON Saturday afternoon, the 10th inst., Mr. Aston Webb conducted a large party from the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society over St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield. This church is one of very special interest, not only from the well-known and picturesque story of its foundation in 1123, but from the fact that, with the exception of the Tower and the Norman remains at Westminster, it is the oldest building in London. At the Reformation the usual mode of dealing with churches partly monastic and partly parochial was reversed, the eastern part being reserved for the parish, while the western was destroyed. The result is that the choir, its aisles and eastern ambulatory, the crossing, and one bay of the nave remain in fair condition; but no church has suffered more grievously from sacrilegious encroachment. By the exertions of the present rector (the Rev. W. Panckridge), however, a movement has been set on foot for buying up the factory which actually infringed upon the eastern apse, a noisy forge, and a school which seriously interfered with the use of the sacred edifice; but funds are sadly required, for there are no fittings or furniture at all suitable for a church of its size and dignity.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Aslachson, Rev. Oscar, M.A., Vicar of Cornworthy.
Blake, Rev. G. L., Chaplain to the *Devastation.*
Blakeney, Ven. John Edward, D.D., Archdeacon and Vicar of Sheffield; Honorary Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.
Bourchier, Rev. W. C., Chaplain to the *Comus.*
Buckingham, Rev. Mortimer Drury, M.A., Vicar of Burrington.
Clark-Kennedy, Rev. Archibald Ewart, B.A., Vicar of Pampisford.
Clutterbuck, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Rector of Hinxworth.
Cox, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Bath and Wells.
Earnes, Rev. J., Chaplain to the *Sultan.*
Edwards, Rev. B., Vicar of Llanwonno; Vicar of Bethws-yn-Rhos, Denbighshire.
Gepp, Rev. Nicholas P., Rector of St. James's, Colchester; Vicar of Great Witchingham with Little Witchingham, near Norwich.
Hamlyn, Rev. James Frederick, B.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Hiron, Rev. Samuel Franklin, D.D., Minister of St. Paul's Chapel, Kilburn.
Howell, Rev. J., Incumbent of Christ Church, Ebbw Vale. Monmouthshire.
Jones, Rev. Thomas, Curate of Llandefeilog; Rector of Llandowror, Carmarthenshire.
Jukes, Rev. A. L., Senior Curate of St. Stephen's, Lewisham; Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Charlton-next-Dover.
O'Neill, Rev. Gerald Owen Kildare M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Peirson, Rev. Ernest Goodwyn, B.A., Rector of Washford Pyne.
Pidcock, Rev. Benjamin Charles, M.A., Chaplain to the *Colossus.*
Roberts. Rev. John Veale, Rector of Ilston, Glamorganshire.
Robinson, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Highamgreen.
Shaw, Rev. John Hall, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Harborne; Vicar of St. Paul's, Ball's Pond, Islington.
Stewart, Rev. F., M.A., Rector of Doddinghurst; Rural Dean of Ingatestone Deanery.
Stokes, Rev. Huddleston, M.A., Viear of Wall; Rural Dean of Lichfield.
Torry, Rev. Alfred Freer, M.A., Rector of Marwood.
Venables-Williams, Rev. Edward, Rector of Whitsbury, Wilts.
Whitaker, Rev. John A., M.A., Rector of Breadsall, Derbyshire.
Whitaker, Rev. Walter Eugene, B.A. Rector of Babington.
Williams, Rev. David, Vicar of Llanelly, Carmarthenshire; Prebendary of Trefloden in St. David's Cathedral.
Williams, Rev. David, M.A., Rector of Merthyr; Fourth Cursal Prebendary in St. David's Cathedral.
Young, Rev. H. Savill, Vicar of Aston Rowant and Rural Dean; Rector of Upton-cum-Chalvey, Slough.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Greaves, Rev. John William, forty-three years Vicar of Ranworth-with Upton, on April 7th, aged 76.
Hildyard, Rev. Horatio S., for forty-four years Rector of Loftus, at Loftus Rectory, on the 10th inst., aged 80.
Lush, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Vicar, at Lee, Ilfracombe, on the 6th inst., aged 60.
McGachen, Rev. John Drummond, M.A., for twenty-six years Vicar of the parish, at St. Bartholomew's Vicarage, Bethnal-green, on the 10th inst., aged 61.
Pearson, Rev. James, M.A. F.R.A.S., for fifteen years Vicar of Fleetwood, at Upper Queen's-terrace, Fleetwood, on the 8th inst., aged 60.
Quin, Rev. Richard, Rector of Forkhill for twenty-eight years, at the Rectory, Forkhill, on the 10th inst., aged 80.
Savery, Rev. J. West, B.A., Curate of Horsenden and Ilmer, formerly Head Master of Helston Grammar-school, and son of the late Rev. G. Savery, at Princes Risborough, on the 3rd inst, aged 29.
Simons, Rev. Nicholas, for nearly forty years Vicar of Bramfield, at Bramfield, on the 10th inst, aged 76.
Taylor, Rev. J. W. Augustus, M.A., late of the Rookery, Headington, at Stoke Headington, on the 10th inst, aged 68.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE DUTY OF STRENGTH.

By the Very Rev. Dean VAUGHAN, D.D.,
Master of the Temple.

Sermon Preached in the Temple Church, on Sunday April 4th, 1886.

"Be strong and of a good courage."—Deuteronomy, xxxi. 23.

"Be strong and of a good courage . . . . Only be strong and of a good courage."—Joshua i. 6, 9, 18.

THE words are the same, and the person addressed is the same, but the speakers vary. The person addressed is Joshua the son of Nun, servant and successor of Moses the man of God. With one exception he is (I think) the only person thus addressed in the Bible. The one other person so addressed is Solomon, son and successor of king David, the man after God's own heart. The one point of likeness between the two persons, the one apparent reason for their being addressed in the same words, is the successorship—minister and successor, son and successor—in the one case, of Moses, in the other case, of David.

To succeed a very great man is one of the severest trials that can be imagined. It suggests a perpetual comparison, it invites a perpetual disparagement, it either depresses the energies, or else stimulates them into exaggerated efforts; at all events it places a man in the most disadvantageous position for doing his best and for having justice done him.

To succeed the great lawgiver, to succeed the great king, was a task so difficult that it might well draw from the sympathy alike of God and man the encouraging exhortation, "Be strong and of a good courage." The task of the new chieftain was difficult indeed. He was called to sit in Moses' seat—a man whom the Lord knew face to face, and had employed to write His will for all ages upon the statute-book and upon the conscience of mankind. He was called to rule where he had served, and to vindicate for himself an authority which hitherto he had asserted, whole and undivided, for another. In comparison with this, exploits of strategy, in an unknown country and against enormous odds, became easy and natural. The real trial (in this aspect) was exercising his generalship under Divine check and direction; compassing, for example, with priests and trumpets, a city against which he was not to lift a hand, and waiting for a victory which he was not to win. To a practical man like Joshua nothing is more difficult than to make room for the supernatural. The passage of the Jordan must have tried him severely, the siege of Jericho must have taxed his patience to the uttermost. "By faith," not by prowess, "the walls of Jericho fell, after being compassed," not assaulted, "for seven days."

The words of the several texts were the same, and the person addressed in those words was the same, but the speakers of the words were different.

The first of them was the great predecessor. That noblest, most heroic, most unselfish of men, though his soul was yet smarting under the chastisement which dashed from his lips the cup of glory, at the very moment of the long life's triumph, yet schooled himself into a submission more beautiful than any victory; thought only how God's government was to be carried on; prayed only that the chosen race might not be left without a shepherd; saw his own servant designated for the work, and bent his last energies to the task of nerving him for a position which was to be his own effacement from the sight and thought of the living.

"Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands upon him," had "given him a charge, saying, Be strong and of a good courage, for thou must go with this people into the land" which I must see, but not enter.

Magnificent example, suitable for all time—suitable to the pastor whose eye is dim and his natural force abated—suitable to the magistrate who must see another seated in his judgment-seat—suitable to the statesman whose race is run, and who must leave to other management the unknown future of a country which he loves too well to dote over.

The second speaker of the words is God Himself. "The Lord spake unto Joshua the son of Nun, Moses' minister, saying, Moses my servant"—my servant still—"is dead: now therefore arise, go over this Jordan, thou and all this people . . . As I was with Moses, so will I be with thee: I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee: be strong and of a good courage."

Inspirer of the courage to which Thou callest us, Thou openest here to us the secret of strength! In all generations Thou art our home and our refuge; Thou puttest down one and settest up another; Thou speakest the "Come" and the "Come again" of the children of men, Thou usest us, and layest aside; in Thee we live and move, in Thee lay us down and sleep—"Show Thy servants Thy work," while it is called to-day, then "show their children Thy glory."

There is yet a third utterer of the precept of courage. It is the voice of the people, saying to the new ruler, "All that thou commandest us we will do, and whithersoever thou sendest us we will go. . . . Only be strong and of a good courage."

Yes, the condition of obedience is the exercise of strength. The people has a right to this in its

ruler. Faint heart and feeble hand half justify the disloyalty which they provoke. The ruler must lead if the ruled are to follow. He is not to say, "Tell me your mind, and I will give effect to it; say ye what I shall do, and I will yield and do it." It is for him to inform the understanding, it is for him to stir the conscience, it is for him to assert and to enforce principles, it is for him to point the way, and leave it to a free people to consent or to refuse to follow him. The ruler of men must be first a man—his tone not the tone of complaisance or flattery, but of conscious strength and of God-breathed courage. The people itself would have it so. "As we hearkened unto Moses, we will hearken unto thee. . . . Only the Lord thy God be with thee," that is one condition—"Only be strong and of a good courage," that is the other.

Brethren, the word of God is quick and powerful—it is of all lands and ages, it is of all conditions and circumstances—may it approve itself to-day in this character, when it speaks to us, in language not at all commonplace or obvious, not at all after the manner of man, not always of the Christian, of the duty of strength, of the spiritual morality of courage.

I have declared this precept to be not after the manner of man. This is quite true in the sense in which I say it. I quite admit that the world has its meed of praise for "strength" as it understands strength. The world admires the strength which forces its way through circumstantial difficulties—which overbears obstacles of birth and rank, of education and society, of opposition and rivalry, and rises from point to point till in one line or another it has achieved greatness. "So long as thou doest well unto thyself, men will speak good of thee"—it is one of those indeed wise men's sayings of which Scripture is full, and it has its confirmation in our experiences of those successes in life which we all ascribe to strength. What force, we say, there must have been in that nature, mental and physical, which has here "raised the beggar from the dunghill, and set him among princes, even among the princes of his people!"

And it would be untrue to say that the world, in its nobler impulses, has no praise to bestow upon moral courage. The man must be far gone, in a degradation which we will never consent to call natural, who feels no glow of generous enthusiasm as he reads of a preservation from flood or fire at the risk or by the sacrifice of a life not counting itself dear in comparison; or of some feat of generous devotion, different in kind yet identical in principle, by which some "brand has been plucked from the burning" of a moral jeopardy as real if less visible. The world has not reached a level so low as to deny its tribute of praise to a strength and a courage attesting itself in sacrifice.

But is there not, side by side with this instinctive admiration of rare and exceptional heroisms, a far commoner and more prevalent sympathy with what are sometimes called natural or even amiable weaknesses, extending very far indeed into the region of practical morals? That sort of character which has no backbone—which cannot nerve or steel itself against the first suggestion of inclination—which resents the entrance into its field of vision of anything which presents itself as a duty—which jests away or smiles away every severe or righteous judgment upon things wrong or sinful—which implies therefore that itself has no strict rule and no imperious conscience—how popular it is, how sure of caresses and flatteries, with multitudes of persons who have no word of most distant approval for the man of ungraceful manners, yet of lofty virtues, boundless charities, and unstinted sacrifices!

And when we pass for one moment from observation to experience, who is there that does not excuse in himself a thousand compromises and compliances, a thousand duplicities and falsehoods, a thousand things which he calls infirmities, but which God calls sins, on the plea of natural disposition, of an inborn incapacity for effort whether in doing or resisting, which he languidly and helplessly counts reason enough for living a life utterly negligent alike of Law and Gospel.

I ventured to say that even the Christian man does not always echo the precept of strength. Language is often held, even in the pulpit, which can only be described as relaxing rather than bracing. The condition of man since the Fall may be so preached as to deserve this reproach. It is impossible, indeed, to overstate the weakness, the helplessness, the bondage, of the will; but it is quite possible to divorce the statement from its Scriptural helpmate, which is the grace of God. Christians are but too ready to welcome the cry, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?" without going on to complete the sentence, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Thus they accept with too ready an acquiescence the bitter self-accusations of the convinced sinner, instead of leading him onward into the new experience in which "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus sets us free from the law of sin and death."

I come back to the animating precept, "Be strong and of a good courage."

And I seek to commend it first by pointing to the opposite experience of the mischiefs of weakness.

Weakness has its excuses and its palliatives. The fallen being is weak. We inherit weakness. The child is weak, in the face of two foes at least, who count nothing too young for them—temper, and appetite. The young man is weak, in the face of other foes—foes which shall be nameless. Advancing age has its foes, their name is legion; they get coarser and uglier day by day; but, depend upon it, the Bible is true, when it represents evil as a system, and a government, and an empire—

place its scene and its capital where you will—there is method in its madness, and we are its victims.

Greater crimes are due to weakness than to wickedness. Men are not devils till very far on in their story; not devils, nor beasts. They sin, at first, and for years, through weakness; yet are they not hereby justified, for they need not be weak. The one sin and crime of which we daily make mention in our Churches—strange, monitory thought that there should be even one such—the sin and the crime of Pilate was a sin of weakness. Pilate was conscious of the innocence of the Just One; that private converse (of which we lately made mention) in the Prætorium proved that to him. Pilate, St. Peter says, "was determined to let Him go." But he was overborne by bigotry, by hatred, by intimidation—"If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend"—and he was induced first to say he would scourge and let go, and then to scourge and not let go. It was weakness. O, if any persuasive voice could have said to Pilate, in that crisis of his moral and spiritual destiny, "Be strong and of a good courage"—but then the voice of philosophy and the voice of religion and the voice of conscience (as he knew each) had not the necessary tone to say it in—we might never have had in our creeds that awful "Crucified under Pontius Pilate," which brands weakness for ever as practically, and for us, the peril of perils and the sin of sins.

And so we come back to our text, which is the duty of strength.

The study of Scripture imperatives is a great deep. Attainments which we should call rare privileges the Bible calls solemn duties. It is so with joy. We say, How delightful it would be to be happy! St. Paul says, "Rejoice in the Lord alway." Would he write into an imperative a mere optative? Would he say, Do this, Be this, if he was only authorized to say, Be thankful if it should come to you?

Thus it is with strength. We say, I wish I was strong. O, how pleasant it would be if I were able to hold the reins of my being in my own hand—if I could say to each inordinate affection, each unruly appetite, each imperious lust, Begone, and it should obey me! St. Paul says, "My son, *be* strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus." Instead of this dallying and temporizing and complimenting with good and evil, be strong and of a good courage.

The text seems to suggest three motives for strength. It implies that strength is possible, possible for each one. And by strength we mean now, strength against evil, strength for good, strength to put away sin, strength to be pure as Christ is pure.

We owe it to the *past*. It is one section of that great chapter of duty which is headed "Predecessors and Successors." Joshua has a duty to Moses. He must not let it be said, "It was delusion which brought Israel out of Egypt. Moses had no Divine legation. To the brink he led us; to attempt to cross Jordan, when he is 'overflowing all his banks in time of harvest,' is suicide. The passage requires of us the impossible; on the other side are the children of Anak and cities walled up to heaven." To be strong was Joshua's tribute to his predecessor. It is so with us. If the Gospel can give us nothing but that poor stunted blighted Christianity to which its alliance with the nineteenth century world has reduced it, then the inference will be drawn, and justly drawn from that premise, "Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." "Like as a dream when one awaketh, so shalt Thou make their image"—the image of their life-faith and death-hope—"to vanish out of the city."

We owe it to *God*. In all lands resounds the word, "Forgiveness through the blood of Jesus." It is the business of the Church to evangelize all nations with this proclamation. But how if this faith gives no strength? How if a supposed forgiveness brings after it no holiness? Justification itself can only be justified at the bar of conscience by sanctification—how then if the Christian is one of the weakest of men in the professed conflict with evil? Can any reproach be greater or so great to the Divine Lord of the Church, if He has either suffered this divorce, or been powerless to forbid it.

Yet, once more, we owe it to our *people*. In all earth's market-places a vast multitude is standing about, athirst and hungry, waiting for a hiring. We say, and we believe it true, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the panacea of human want and woe—at once, for the soul—in its sure consequences, might it but be generally embraced, for the world of society and for the world of mankind. But what if we ourselves—we who say this, and believe it true—are seen to be utterly beaten and routed in the personal battle, which is the moral being—weak with the weak, or weaker than the weakest, in the conflict with our own bad tempers, paltry self-indulgences, besetting sins? How if we have no high ideal in process (at least) of realization—nothing to show, and nothing to adduce in evidence, but what is so poor and so silly and so earthy that the world would be rather the worse than the better if it took us for its models? The people said to Joshua, "All that thou commandest us we will do;" but then they added, and they were right to add, "Only be thou strong."

Brethren, let us try. St. James says, "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." St. James says, "Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you." We have done neither. Was it entirely want of faith, or was there perhaps, mingling with that, a want of will—a secret

hankering after the weakness, a secret dread lest God should draw nigh?

Let us try. If not as a promise, then read it as a command. It is our duty to be strong. We owe it to our ancestry. We must not let it be said, we must not give occasion for it to be said, that they believed a lie. We owe it to God. We must not let it be said, or give occasion for it to be said, God sent us a Saviour who could not save. We owe it to our race. Suffering, weary, wretched as it is, we must not kill its one hope. We must not, through our weakness—a weakness which need not be for one day or hour—make the desire of nations undesirable to such as cry for bread, and cannot accept a stone.

"I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one. . . . I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one."

## "THREE BOOKS OF GOD."

By the Rev. GORDON CALTHROP, M.A., Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury.

Sermon Preached at St. Matthew's, Denmark Hill, on Sunday, March 14th, 1886.

"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork."—Psalm xix. 1.

IT is not very difficult to believe that the Psalm from which my text has been taken, is one of the Psalms of King David. David had been a shepherd in his youth, and we can imagine him gazing up, by night, into the purple depths of the oriental sky, and contemplating the stars that hung out their bright lamps overhead, as he lay, surrounded by his flocks, on the soft fragrant grass of the uplands of Bethlehem; or we can as easily imagine him watching the outburst of the sun from the dark caverns of the under world, the triumphant progress of the blazing luminary, as he runs his appointed course in the day, scattering blessings round him; and then, the calm grandeur of his setting in the west, when his work is over, and he shoots one parting golden glance at the earth, which he is still so soon to leave.

These things, to David, would be something more than to other men; for he was gifted with the heart and mind of a poet. They would awaken deeper thoughts; they would touch finer strings in his nature; and impel him to express his emotions in glowing and beautiful song. But David was a devout man, as well as a poet, and the scenes which he beheld, would inevitably suggest to him the idea of the great Creator and sustainer of all. The outward beauty would be, in his estimation, only the expression and exponent of the beauty which lay behind the veil, and, through nature, his soul would instinctively rise up to the contemplation of nature's God.

It was in some such moment of rapture, we suppose, that the psalm before us was written, the thought which possesses the writer's mind being simply this: that there is a wonderful revealing of God in His works, but a still more wonderful revealing of God in His word.

I. Let us take this idea for our consideration this evening. Some one has said, that, "The book of nature has three leaves, the sky, the earth, and the sea;" and that of these three, the first is the most important; inasmuch, as it is by means of it that we became cognisant of the other two. However this may be, you will agree with me, I am sure, when I say, that there are few things so calculated to elevate our conceptions of the Divine Being as the contemplation of the starry heavens. A night or two ago, I looked up into the sky, to watch the stars, as they sparkled with unusual brilliance through the frosty air. There was no moon, or at least only a very feeble one, to spoil the scene with her obtrusive light. The host of the stars had it all their own way. On the left was Orion, that magnificent giant, with his burnished zone, stooping grandly and silently over the wilderness of houses, in which we dwell. Not far off shone the Great Bear, the aerial plough, calmly ploughing his way through the fields of Heaven. And, as I looked up again, I saw the Pleiades, like a "swarm of fire-flies tangled in a silver braid," suggesting, by their dim and distant loveliness, the immense reaches of space, into the depths of which I was gazing. And David's language in the Psalms rushed irresistibly into my mind: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork."

Then thought I to myself, "I am happier than even King David was, in one respect at least. It is true I am no poet, no man of genius, but the advance of knowledge in the many centuries which have elapsed since his time has given me conceptions which could not so much as have occurred to him. These bright spots, these islets of brilliant light, are vast masses, huge worlds, almost infinitely larger than this earth of ours, almost infinite in number, and almost all of them, central suns, having each its own system, of planets, revolving round, and dependent upon it."

Amidst this vastness, the mind absolutely loses itself. To say nothing of the wonder of the creation of these worlds, of the calling them into existence, what must it be simply to preserve the gigantic piece of mechanism in good working order? What must it be to harness each mass by invisible bands, to its own central sun, and then to harness each system in its turn to the one central sun of all; and then, to keep a strong hand over the whole, so that there shall be no jostling, no confusion, no entangling, no disarray, nothing but perfect harmony throughout the illimitable

scene? The wisdom that could plan all this; the power that could effect it; what must they both of them be?

But here another thought suggests itself; do we derive from this magnificent view anything like an assurance of the Divine goodness? I think not. We may conjecture that these vast worlds are, (at all events most of them,) not unpeopled; and conjecturing this, we may suppose that their inhabitants are watched over and provided for by the bounty of the great Creator; and that we should therefore find in them, if we could only visit them, the most abundant, the most striking, the most amazing exhibitions of the Divine benevolence and love. But after all, this is mere supposition. We have no proof; and so (when we come to look into the matter closely), we discover that the revelation of God, which we have been contemplating, remarkable as it is, is a very imperfect one; and that the voice which sounds from the Heavens proclaims that God is "wisdom" and that God is "power," but only whispers, if it whispers at all, that "God is love."

Let us turn then to another leaf of the Book. Let us come down from the stars, and come nearer home. I plant you on the sea coast; on one of the white cliffs, which we all of us know and love so well, and I tell you to look round you. Is it not a fair spot; a scene full of calm and tranquil beauty? There is just enough breeze to ripple into countless smiles the surface of old Ocean, and to swell out the sails of the stately vessels as they float on, carrying their merchandise to distant lands. The sun gleams on the white wings of the seabirds, and sparkles on the wet sand and shingle, that you see below you. Right and left of you stretches the coast, with the line of foam breaking gently on the shore, with boats here and there drawn up in quiet little nooks, with houses creeping down almost to the water's edge, with inward glimpses of meadows and cornfields and ivy-crowned church towers; and, as the joyous cry of little children at their play rises up to your ears, you say to yourself, "Yes, God is good—this scene proves beyond dispute, that God is good." But would you have said so if you had stood there a few months ago? Then a wild storm lashed that calm and placid bay into fury; and the black clouds gathered, and ships were hurled against the rocks, and man after man went down with a despairing cry, into the whirl of waters, almost within reach of the pitying hands stretched out so earnestly, and yet so fruitlessly to save. Would you have said it then? I doubt it. Ah! brethren, there are always two sides to the question which nature presents, but I need give you no more illustrations. There is something in nature which speaks loudly of the Divine goodness, but then again, there is something which seems to protest against the statement; and we are left in confusion and perplexity. What, then, shall we do? Shall we shut our first Book, and toss it away? Not so! We will keep it open, we will read it; we will try to understand it; we feel that it tells us much about God, very much, but still, not all that we wish and want to know.

II. And now, we take up another Book, the book of human history. This, I feel, is a very difficult volume to decipher. That God is working in human history, that all that is transpiring on the theatre of events, wars and rumours of wars, political changes and combinations, famines and pestilences, the rise and the fall of dynasties, the progress and the decay of nations, the spread of commerce, the increase of knowledge—that all these things contribute their share to the accomplishment of the Divine purposes, I suppose none of us will be inclined to doubt. God is not likely, we feel, to let the world, which is His world, go on by itsellf.

But understanding the divine plans—that is a very different matter! The fact is, we see so infinitesimally small a portion of the web as it comes forth from the sounding loom of time, that we can hardly take upon ourselves to pronounce upon the pattern. But there is a second, a smaller volume of the book, which perhaps it is easier for us to comprehend. I mean the volume of our own personal history. Brethren, we may learn a good deal of what God is, by the way in which He has dealt, and is dealing, with us. Look at the discipline of life, which you have already passed through. Have you not learned that the God with whom you have to do, is patient and gentle and kind? Have you not found that He is wise and firm? Have you not discovered that He is too loving to give you up to your own self-will, and too gracious to be out-wearied with your unworthiness, and yet too holy and righteous to be trifled with?

Let us *all* look into the volume. Is not our past history really, to us, a revelation of God? and is it not a revelation which it is most important and most desirable to possess, and most important and most desirable to understand aright?

III. We have thus two Books of God, brethren, the Book of Nature, and the Book of our own personal history, and we may turn the leaves of both of them with profit, but there is yet a third "Book of God" which is better still, because fuller and clearer—the Book of the Word, and of that I will now proceed to speak. The "Word" is the story of Jesus Christ, or (perhaps more correctly speaking) Jesus Christ Himself. God is revealed in the person of Jesus Christ, and again, God is revealed in the way in which he dealt with Jesus Christ. Let us consider these two points. I sometimes wonder, brethren, if you and I had been told that God was about to manifest Himself in a human form, whether we should have formed, even approximately, such a conception as that of Jesus Christ. I rather suspect that we should

not. I do not know what our idea would have been—probably one would have thought one thing, another, another—but we should none of us, unless I am much mistaken, have come near the truth.

The gentle, homely, tender, sympathising, lowly, unpretending, accessible, friendly, brotherly man of Nazareth,—it would have seemed to us almost impossible that He could be a representative, a counterpart of the great and awful Jehovah. I pray you, however, to remember, brethren, that there are formidable features in the character of Jesus of Nazareth! There are flashes of fire in Him. To some, He is dangerous. It is possible to provoke him too far. He will weep tears of pity over doomed Jerusalem, but yet He will not, when the time comes, shrink from executing the predetermined vengeance in all its severity.

I pray you, brethren, let us not be one-sided in our estimate of Jesus Christ. Yet, certainly, the humility and the love preponderate, or seem to preponderate, in the character, and these are what we should not naturally expect to find in one who was to be an exact representative of God Himself. Let us hear, then, what Jesus says Himself. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." What does He mean by "seeing"? Clearly He means that right judgment, that true opinion, that correct estimate which is dependent upon sympathy witn Himself, that sympathy being, as we believe, dependent upon the teaching of the Holy Spirit. It is possible, brethren, as you know, to "see" Christ, and yet to misunderstand Him totally. He was so seen, when He was upon earth, He is so "seen" now.

The Jewish ecclesiastics, nearly nineteen hundred years ago, saw Christ, and condemned Him to death as an impostor and a blasphemer, because (as they said), He being man, made Himself to be God. The populace in those same days saw Christ, and could discover nothing in Him but a preacher of sermons, and a worker of wonders. Herod "saw" Christ, and thought Him crazy. Pilate "saw" Christ, and came to the conclusion that He was a weak and harmless enthusiast far too insignificant to deserve to be put to death. And in days nearer our own, some have "seen" in Christ the interested demagogue who was disappointed in establishing His supremacy over the Jewish people, and others have regarded Him as a soft idyllic personage attractive in His manners, and sentimental in His character, who was not over particular about the truth, and who would readily connive at a piece of barefaced impudence, in the hopes of regaining His popularity when it was beginning to wane. Yes, brethren, it is possible enough to misunderstand Christ.

But if we see Him—in the broad light which the Holy Spirit pours round His figure, and not by the tapers of our own human speculation—we shall see God in Him, and know Him to be in truth the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person. Knowing Christ—we shall know God.

But as I just said God is displayed also in His treatment of Jesus Christ. Bearing in mind, brethren, who Jesus is—that He is the true Son of God, the only-begotten, the Son in whom God is always well pleased—turn to the fact stated in Holy Scripture, that on the head of this Son was accumulated a load of almost inconceivable misery, that he was ill-used, and shamed, and tortured, and died as a criminal on Calvary, crucified between two thieves. And why was this? Had God ceased to love Him, and to care for Him, and so given Him over into the hands of His enemies? That was impossible. God never loved His Son so well as when that Son lay prostrate in agony under the shadow of the grey olive trees of Gethsemane, or hung dying upon the bloodstained cross of Calvary.

*It was because it was necessary.* Yes! "necessary!" Do you think God makes any mistakes? Do you think that God could make a mistake in such a matter as this? And why necessary? Because Jesus was then and there the representative of sinners, the Lamb of God, that taketh, and taketh away, the sin of the world.

I draw two simple conclusions. The first I put into the form of a question, or rather of two questions. If God did not spare His own Son when He stood as the representative of sinners, do you think He will spare you and me, if we choose to undertake to answer for our own sin? And again, if sin had the power to reach up its long black arm, and pluck the Son of God from His eternal throne, and bring Him down, and nail Him to a cross, and fling Him into a grave, what power, do you not think, sin will have over you and me, if we are left defenceless and exposed to its will?

My second and last thought is of a brighter kind. I should like to end by striking a cheerful note. Let us bethink ourselves, brethren, again, who Jesus was; not a man, not an angel; not an archangel, not a created being at all,—but God's own Son. Why then, when God smote His own Son for the sin of the world, He did really smite Himself, and take that sin to His own heart. God (I do not know how to express the mystery), bore the burden of our sin Himself. I cannot explain it, but I can see the character of God in it; and I feel that though I could not trust a being whose attributes were only "wisdom" and "power," I can, with my whole heart and soul, trust a being whose chief glory and highest name is immeasurable and ineffable *love*.

---

THE Bishop of Carlisle, accompanied by his son-in-law, the Rev. H. M. Spooner, has left England on a tour of the United States.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 24, 1886.

## WEAR AND TEAR OF MODERN LIFE.

A DISCUSSION on the above subject, recently initiated by Dr. Roose in the *Fortnightly Review*, has been treated in a manner befitting its importance. There has long prevailed a conviction that we are living at too fast a rate, and that this pressure shows signs of increase rather than of decrease.

There is no reason to dispute the prevalent impression that nervous diseases are commoner now than formerly, and that we suffer much more than our forefathers from the sense of pressure, worry, and unrest. This high tension prevails more or less in all our large centres of population, and we cannot regard its possible future increase without apprehension both for the present and future generations. It seems to be the inevitable outcome of modern civilisation. Steam has not merely quickened physical movement, but has accelerated every department of life and manners. The telegraph and the telephone mark the victory of the nineteenth century over space and time, but we pay for the boon in an increased expenditure of vital energy. Education has enlarged its scope and its claims at so rapid a rate, that already many are demanding a halt. We do not anticipate that civilisation will arrest its onward career or abate its claims. We cannot put the drag on human progress, or modify at will the complicated conditions of modern society. But, while we can do little to stay the onward rush of modern progress, it is worth our while to inquire what are its peculiar dangers, and whither it is surely tending? Medical science offers us this preliminary consolation: Hard work, physical or mental, is not only not injurious, but actually healthful. The hard-worked muscle, whether of arm or heart, responds to the stimulus, and receives an accession of vigour and development. The hard-worked brain, if placed under favourable conditions for its activity, becomes more vigorous and fruitful. Indolent inactivity of mind or body is undoubtedly far more hurtful to both physical and intellectual vigour than severe labour, provided only that the labour be pursued under healthful conditions of food, air, rest, and sleep. This, in brief, is the teaching of science—that not labour, but its too often abnormal environment, is responsible for the deterioration of the physical and intellectual powers. The factory operative who succumbs at forty dies not of hard work, but of foul air and defective diet. Over-pressure in schools means, for the most part, not that the brain is getting too much food, but that the stomach is getting too little. The student induces brain-weariness, not merely by excessive study, but by late hours, insufficient sleep, lack of fresh air, and, maybe, an undue partiality for the tobacco-leaf or the tea-pot. The need of modern life is not that we should remove the pressure of work, which is not possible, but that we should learn to work under healthful and natural conditions. Much vexation, disappointment, and disease would be averted, if we would ascertain the limits of our powers, and understand that to exceed them is not an economy of time, but precisely the reverse. Science gives us a further consolation in its discovery that rest is not to be found in inertness, but in change of occupation. The over-worked man often seeks in vain for recreation in absolute idleness; he forgets that he is no longer a child, and that he has lost for ever the capacity of being idle. But a distinct change of occupation gives the distraction and recreation which he needs. Thus we see a great statesman spending the leisure of the Parliamentary recess in maintaining a philosophic controversy, or a great naturalist turning aside to discourse on the choice of books. It is some consolation to know that the weary brain-worker need not seek absolute idleness, but, by turning aside into fresh pastures, may find new material for the healthful exercise of that mental activity which has become second nature. The conclusion at which we arrive is, then, that the need of our age is not rest and stagnation, but healthful conditions for work, freedom from worry, suitable variety, and a wise distribution of our time. In the April number of the *Fortnightly Review* Dr. Roose resumes the thread of his former discourse, and indicates some of the remedies for "wear and tear." He enlarges with knowledge and good sense upon food, rest, sleep, recreation, and kindred topics. On some points—for example, the value of horse exercise to the brain-worker, the importance of rest, not only after but before eating, and the necessity that the annual holiday should afford mental distraction as well as physical repose—we can strongly endorse the opinions of the writer. Dr. Roose's articles are apt and timely, sober and practical, and express opinions generally entertained by thoughtful medical men, and are well worth the attention of the wide circle of busy brain-workers, who require not a prohibition of work, but help and guidance towards its easier and better accomplishment.

## THE GROANING OF CREATION AND OF THE CHRISTIAN.

By the Very Rev. DANIEL BAGOT, D.D., Dean.

Paper Read at the Richmond Clerical Society Meeting in Surbiton, on Monday, the 12th April, 1886.

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanty, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected *the same* in hope, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of the body." —Romans viii. 19-23.

THE Apostle Peter in the third chapter of his Second Epistle, verse 16, refers to the Epistles of St. Paul as containing "Some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest unto their own destruction." It is extremely probable that this important and difficult passage is one of those which St. Peter had principally in his mind. We may infer this from what he says in the beginning of the 16th verse of the chapter alluded to, "As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things. . . ." that is, of the new heavens and the new earth, of which St. Peter himself had been just speaking in the 13th verse.

Now I believe that the principal reason why this passage has appeared to so many to be peculiarly difficult, is—because they have wrested it, or, in other words, have diverted and distorted it from its plain and obvious signification, by giving it what they call a spiritual interpretation which in fact renders it altogether inextricably mysterious and incomprehensible. If we desire to arrive at a tangible and intelligible exposition of it, we must explain it in a direct and literal sense.

The Apostle had just been speaking of the future glory which the Christian is destined to enjoy in contrast with the sufferings which he has to endure in this present life. "I reckon," said he, "that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us" —and then he at once enters in the passage under our immediate consideration into a statement of what that glory is, as the grand and magnificent result of the great redeeming enterprise of Christ.

There are two or three expressions in these verses which require to be distinctly explained. The principal one is the word κτίσις which is rendered "creature" in the 19th, 20th, and 21st verses and "creation" in the 22nd. I reject at once the interpretations which say that this word here denotes either the Gentile world or human nature in general, as not having the slightest shadow of proof for their foundation. Nor can I agree with those who spiritualise the passage and explain this term as meaning the new creation, for if so, it would require a qualifying adjective to be attached to it, as in 2 Cor. v. 17—"If any man be in Christ, He is a new creature," καινὴ κτίσις. Besides in verse 19, "The sons of God," who are the same as new creatures, are mentioned as a distinct and separate class from what the word rendered "creature" denotes—"the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God," and in verse 23, it appears that those "who have the first fruits of the Spirit," who are also the same as new creatures, are a more limited and restricted class than what is implied by the word rendered "creature."

In short, this word should be rendered "creation" and not "creature," in all the four instances in which it occurs in this passage. It means the whole material system, both animate and inanimate, connected with this world as the present residence of fallen man; of which it is said in the 22nd verse—"The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." I shall endeavour to explain the other expressions as I proceed in unfolding the several statements of which this passage consists.

Here, then, I believe it to be asserted that this whole creation has suffered a physical degradation by the fall of man. There is such an intimate association, or, as it were, a sympathy between man and his inheritance—"the earth which God has given to the children of men"—that when the curse fell upon man it fell at the same time with a corresponding or analogous infliction upon his inheritance likewise. Sin, which made man subject to death, made his inheritance subject to what is here called "vanity," and involved the earth in a curse which implied and caused a physical deterioration parallel to the moral degradation of its rational inhabitant, so that there has been a fall of matter as well as a fall of man; as it is written: "Cursed is the ground for thy sake . . . . thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee." (Gen. iii. 17, 18.)

The condition into which the whole creation has been thus brought is here called "vanity" and "the bondage of corruption," which phrases imply that it is reduced to a state of abject debility and decay, exhibiting a total absence of all present tendency fully to answer the purposes for which it was originally brought into existence; debased into a state of comparative worthlessness and disorganisation, which is the very negation of usefulness, so that when we survey it, we may well exclaim in the words of the preacher: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity."

The immediate cause of this subjection of the creation to this state of vanity is here mentioned. It became so "not willingly," for it had no will with which to consent to, or be an accomplice in, its own degradation, nor had it any natural or inherent principle of decay in it, for the creation was pronounced by its Creator to have been "very good"; but it was by reason of him who "subjected it." Some commentators refer this to Adam, whose sin brought down the world into a state of physical debasement. Others, I think more correctly, refer it to God himself who pronounced the judicial sentence by which the ground was cursed immediately after the fall of Adam—"cursed is the ground for thy sake."

This subjection to vanity extends to the entire creation so far as it is connected with the earth, which is the residence of man. The very soil of our globe has been visited with a curse. The animal creation are suffering from the effects of man's sin. The very elements of nature are out of order, and desolation is brooding far and wide over the earth. An immense extent of this world's soil and surface is marred and defaced as regards fertility and beauty, and has become the haunts of beasts of prey. What a mass of poverty, disease, and destitution is everywhere to be seen! How innumerable are the dark places of the earth, which are full of the habitations of cruelty! And as to man himself, what a sad and sorrowful

spectacle does he display in his natural state ; whether we think of him as to his intellectual, or moral, or social, or political relationships.

But we are here told that the whole creation shall be delivered from this state of "vanity," and from this "bondage of corruption." Its debasement is only temporary, and is not to be eternal. The promise of a Redeemer for man, which was given immediately after the Fall (Gen. iii. 15), contained in it the root and foundation of a hope that his inheritance would also be redeemed. God "hath subjected the same in hope (not 'because,' but) that the creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," or into a condition of freedom analogous to the glorious state of freedom into which the children of God shall be brought by virtue of their spiritual emancipation through their redemption by Christ. Liberty is here contrasted with bondage, and glory with corruption. This earth is man's inheritance and appointed habitation, and as it has been involved in the consequences of his degradation, it shall participate, according to its nature, in the results of redemption. A renovated being must have a suitably renovated abode. There shall, in fact, be a physical glorification of the material world in which we now live and move and have our being. It shall be purified and encircled with a resplendent mantle of light and beauty and fertility. Instead of the dark and dismal aspect that now as a funeral pall overspreads the surface of creation, "the mountains and the hills shall break forth into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands ;" "instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree ;" the entire face of Nature shall be renewed, and all that now mars its harmony, its symmetry, and its loveliness, shall be rectified or removed. For this earth is not, as some suppose, to be annihilated or destroyed, nor is the locality of the eternal Kingdom, in which the saints are to reign with Christ, to be far away in some different and distant portion of the Universe. Such a notion, however popular and prevalent, is, as Professor Tholuck observes, altogether a modern one. This earth which is now a very charnel-house of corruption, and which is groaning and travailing in pain under the pressure of the curse, shall be changed into a suitable residence for the sons of God. They "shall reign on the earth" (Rev. v. 10) ; first for a thousand years during the millennial dispensation (Rev. xx. 6), and then for ever and ever (Rev. xxii. 5). This great and glorious consummation of the redeeming enterprise of Christ is what he refers to in Matt. xix. 28, as "the regeneration, when he shall sit upon the throne of His glory." It is what St. Peter calls "the restitution of all things" (Acts iii. 21) ; what St. Paul alludes to in Eph. i. 14, as the redemption of the purchased possession ; and what St. Peter again speaks of as the establishment of the "new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Peter iii. 12)

This deliverance of the whole creation is spoken of in the passage under consideration as the object of hope, and the creation itself is represented as waiting in earnest expectation for it. It is very common in Scripture to attribute to the contents of inanimate nature the feelings and actions of rational and thinking beings, as, for instance, we find the psalmist, when anticipating this great and glorious change, saying : "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad ; let the sea roar and the fulness thereof ; let the field be joyful, and all that is therein ; then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord, for He cometh, He cometh to judge the earth ; He shall judge the world with righteousness and the people with truth" (Psalm xcvi.)

The time when this deliverance is to be effected is here definitely specified. It is to take place at "the manifestation of the sons of God"—that is, at the resurrection of the just, or at the first resurrection of which saints or sons of God shall alone be the subjects, and which therefore proves and manifests those who shall then rise to be sons of God. The advent of Christ and the resurrection of those who are dead in Christ shall be the signal for the complete accomplishment of the beneficent purposes of God's redeeming love.

The apostle having represented the whole creation as groaning under the superincumbent pressure of the curse, and as travailing in pain, but with the hope of a future deliverance, next represents believers in Christ as likewise "groaning within themselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." The former groaning is the groaning of nature, arising from a feeling of dissatisfaction with its present state, the latter is the groaning of grace in the new creature, who, in addition to a feeling of dissatisfaction, has such a revelation of his future destiny presented to him as incites him to look forward to its enjoyment with earnest and intense desire, so as even to "rejoice in hope of the glory of God."

Those who are represented as thus groaning are said to be those "who have the first fruits of the Spirit." The Spirit which has been procured and sent by Christ, is given to all who believe to bear witness with their spirits that they are children of God (Rom. viii. 16), and to work in them to will and to work (Phil. ii. 13). His sanctifying effects are called the fruits of the Spirit, which are "love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" (Gal. v. 22, 23). These graces are here called the "first fruits of the Spirit," because they are a specimen of what the children of God will be, in their character, when their sanctification shall be complete, and in the meantime they are the earnest of their inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession. (2 Cor. v. 5 ; Eph. i. 14)

But notwithstanding their having this earnest, the children of God still groan. They often feel within themselves heavings of sadness and depression to which they cannot give utterance ; arising from an infelt sense of sin, from what they feel from the assaults of temptation, from the pressure of affliction, and the burden of the flesh. While other men groan under the pain and punishment which sin entails, they groan under a deep and penetrating conviction of the exceeding sinfulness and hatefulness of sin itself. They do not, however, groan from any feeling of despair, but they groan in expectation' "waiting for the adoption," that is, for the redemption of their body."

There is a two-fold adoption. Believers in Christ already possess the spirit of adoption, whereby they are privileged even now to address God as their Father (Rom. viii. 15), but they are also looking forward with hope to another adoption, which is here called the redemption of the body, and which is the realised and manifested consummation of the former. The word "redemption" is also used in two senses, either for the payment of the ransom price, or for the actual redemption of that for which the ransom

price has been paid. Redemption in the former sense was effected by Christ, when at his first advent he gave his life as a ransom for the guilty (Matt. xx. 28; Gal. iii. 13; iv. 4, 5; 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 Peter i. 18, 19). Redemption in the latter sense will be accomplished when Christ comes again (Luke xxi. 28; Eph. i. 14; iv. 30).

The redemption work of Christ has three objects in view—our souls, our bodies, and our inheritance. The last, or the redemption of our inheritance, is that for which the whole creation groaneth; the second, or the redemption of the body, is that for which the believer groans; the first, or the redemption of our souls, is partially effected even now, so far as we have the firstfruits of the Spirit within us, but it will be complete hereafter, when "that which is perfect is come," when we shall have come "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (1 Cor. xiii. 10; Eph. iv. 13).

It is for the redemption of the body that the Apostle represents the Christian to be waiting. He does not desire to be found naked or without a body. In the earthly house of his present tabernacle or bodily frame he groans, being burdened, not for that he would be unclothed, but clothed upon with his house, which is from heaven, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life (2 Cor. v. 1, 4). Some Christians appear to be waiting rather for the liberation of their souls from their bodies at death, than for the redemption of their bodies at the first resurrection. And indeed there are Christians who seem to think that in the eternal state they shall have no material bodies. They either suppose that sinfulness is a necessary and essential attribute of matter, or because it is said that they shall be "as the angels which are in heaven" (Mark xii. 25); then, assuming that angels have not bodies, they suppose that they shall have no bodies. But where did they learn that angels have no bodies? They are, it is true, spiritual and celestial beings, but then there are spiritual and celestial bodies as well as animal and terrestrial. In short, when the redemption of our bodies shall be completely effected, instead of our present weak, corruptible animal and mortal bodies, we shall have bodies that shall be powerful, incorruptible, spiritual, and immortal, fashioned by Christ himself into a likeness to His glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself (1 Cor. xv. 42-53; Phil. iii. 21; 1 John iii. 2).

Let us then rejoice in the stupendous and magnificent results of the great redeeming enterprise of Christ, which we are now privileged and permitted to anticipate in sure and certain hope, and let us continually seek to realise in our present experience that growth in grace, which is the pledge and earnest of what we shall be when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, and when we shall appear with him in glory.

---

HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN, FOR MAY, 1886. —SELECTED BY THE REV. JOHN NAPLETON.—2nd, First Sunday after Easter. Morning: 137, 126 (1), 140. Evening: 126 (2), 174, 232.—9th, Second Sunday after Easter. Morning: 300, 170, 345. Evening: 129, 378, 18. 16th, Third Sunday after Easter. Morning: 241, 227, 10. Evening: 302, 240, 178 (3).—23rd, Fourth Sunday after Easter. Morning: 36, 225, 316. Evening: 179, 308, 141.—30th, Rogation Sunday. Morning: 143, 196, 230. Evening: 142, 274, 323.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### FREE TRADE.

SIR,—In reference to matter in the letters of your correspondents to-day, I have to correct one or two of their expressions of statement. Mr. Gurney says that all other countries than England "are Protectionist on principle, with a view to forwarding the interests of home production." Add to this—"home productions" *of special kinds*, and it is right. No country but Spain, that I know of, levies taxes upon *all* foreign commodities. Germany, the United States, etc., impose protective taxes for the purpose, not of forwarding the interests of producers in general, but of certain favoured producers—favoured at the cost and loss of the community in general. But this is not being Protectionist in principle universally, it is being so in the exceptional cases, and in them only; and in reality avowedly so.

The German school of economists, Lizt and others, devote attention more to the distribution than to the production of wealth; and their advocacy of interference is in every case advanced with views towards regulating that distribution. They are not without sympathisers here, even among those who profess to be Free Traders. But when I find your correspondent so much misunderstanding Adam Smith as he does, I must at least suspect that he misunderstands the others also. As I read the "Wealth of Nations," its author has no other conception of wealth than as the result of production. I have searched the book for the passage Mr. Gurney alludes to, wherein he supposes that Smith advocates Protection to native agriculture. I cannot find it, or anything like it. But I find in chapter ix. of Book IV., the following: "Every system which endeavours, either by extraordinary encouragements to draw towards a particular species of industry a greater share of the capital of the society than what would naturally go to it, or by extraordinary restraints to force from a particular species of industry some share of the capital which would otherwise be employed in it, is in reality subversive of the great purpose which it means to promote. It retards, instead of accelerating, the progress of the society towards real wealth and greatness. . . . All systems, either of preference or restraint, therefore, being thus completely taken away, the obvious and simple system of liberty establishes itself of its own accord."

Exchange, your correspondent says, is secondary to production; which I shall not impugn, only observe that it is secondary in the same way as food is secondary to life, which cannot exist without food. The question of the amount of undug coal that there is in England is not I think an economical question. The science of economics is an investigation into the laws according to which wealth is produced and distributed; it is not an art with the production of wealth for its end. Does your correspondent want to put the manufacturers of England on short rations for coal? Or does he think that an Act of Parliament can increase the quantity of coal under the earth?

He mistakes me if he thinks that I make an idol of money cheapness; if he apprehended the concluding paragraph of my last letter, he would see that I accord

no admiration to the present condition of low prices. Nor do I "consider" the interest of "consumers" as the only thing to be considered. On the contrary, I think the State should in matters of trade "consider" nobody's interests, but allow them to take care of themselves.

Any person desiring to arrive at fundamental ideas in economic science can do no better than study the more elementary parts of algebra, and get to a conception of the meaning of *plus* and *minus*. All opposition to the Free Trade doctrine is based on the vague and erroneous notion, that exchange results in loss except under certain (or uncertain) circumstances. It is no impeachment of the doctrine to question if it be anywhere carried out. Of course it is not carried out, and will not be so long as there is a custom-house or an excise-office in the world. Those are institutions that could be dispensed with to universal and absolutely unlimited advantage. If, from reasons of morality, it be thought desirable to regulate the trade in drinks, this should be done through a proper system of licenses. But sound economy admits of no indirect taxation whatever.

If the paragraph in my letter which is not clear to Mr. Sandlands be that in which I state the answer to the "Protection" fallacy, perhaps the quotation above from the "Wealth of Nations" may be of assistance. Mr. Sandlands says that I have not answered the question, why trade at present is bad. He cannot have finished reading my letter. The cause of bad trade at this time—bad trade all over Europe and America, generally though not universally—is low prices; and the cause of low prices is a change in the value of gold, proceeding since about fifteen or twenty years ago. Your correspondent was last year at Chemnitz, or some other manufacturing town in Germany, and found trade there good. I can point him out several flourishing industries in this country, bad as things are. Trade in Germany on the whole is not good now, nor in the United States; people are, however, hoping for improvement, the coming of which in any force I doubt, until the balance between the values of gold and silver shall become once more fixed.

"We handicap the home produce (producer?), and we make the course free and easy to the foreigner. Is this fair?" It is not fair, nor true either. We handicap no producer at home that I know of, unless we do so by our objectionable taxes on articles instead of on property and income; and we leave, in most things, the course free and easy *to ourselves*, to buy where we can get the best value. If your correspondent supposes, as I believe some persons do, that if we should impose taxes on goods coming from abroad, any but the consumer of those goods would pay the taxes, he is under an absolute error. This is a thing that hardly requires more than the mere statement to establish it; but if experience be demanded, it is a thing known to all men practically acquainted with trade, as familiar to them as the multiplication table.

Mr. Sandlands says that in saying that trade increased in spite of and not in consequence of the removal of restrictions on it, he meant "what he said," viz., that trade would have increased in any case. Now if I am any judge of the meaning of language, the two statements are not the same, and have not even a particle in common. I am quite sure that had the Corn and Navigation Laws not been repealed, even then the amount of English foreign commerce, owing to the new channels at that time opened (1846-50), would have increased, and largely. But the removal of restrictions enabled the increase to be greater than it would have been without the removal. "There are," your correspondent says, "plenty of facts to prove this"; that is, to prove "that trade increased in spite of, and not in consequence of, Free Trade." I am prepared to hear much that is not reasonable concerning economical questions, and to reply to it, when need is; but to say that there are "facts" to prove that something would have occurred if something else had not been done, in a matter of this kind, is really going too far.

B.

April 17th, 1886.

---

SIR,—Mr Gurney says, in his letter of the 10th April, that he is afraid "B." and "H. W." are impervious to reason or *fact*.

I gave him, in my letter of the same date, a good many *facts*, and will add one or two more now.

1. In the thirty years ending 1881, the population of England and Wales increased more than ten millions, being at the rate of about 62 per cent.

2. During the same period labour-saving machinery of enormous power was introduced into all agricultural operations.

3. The land to be cultivated or occupied remained the same, or was increased only to a fractional extent by bits of waste enclosed here and there.

Is it any wonder that the larger portion of the human element in this increased working power, could not find work to do in the old area, and sought it elsewhere—in the towns, or by emigration?

A *residuum* has remained behind, earning better wages than its predecessors could; and the rural population as a whole has increased, that increase amounting to over 7 per cent in the last decade. "The essential nature of things" like "prophecy" is beyond me, and I cannot follow Mr. Gurney into such altitudes.

I read Mr. Howorth's letters with the care they deserved, but was not convinced by them.

H.W.

April 17th, 1886.

P.S.—There is a slight printer's error in the last paragraph but one in my previous letter; *shall* having been printed for *should*, in the eighteenth line from the top.

---

## ST. PAUL THE AUTHOR OF THE ACTS.

SIR,—I must apologise for troubling you so soon again. I have, however, only just seen Dr. Alfred Plummer's letter in your issue of April 10th, in which he says, with reference to my work on the Acts, "More fatal tactics could not well be adopted." Will you kindly allow me to say, in reply, that the apparent "paradox" refers to a question, not of *tactics*, but of *truth*. *Fiat veritas, ruat cœlum*, (*et traditio et præjudicium*). Dr. Plummer's conclusions would obviously be entitled to more weight, had he not, by his own confession, wholly prejudged the case. This at least demands a dispassionate, judicial tone of mind. As M. Paul Janet observes, "No preconceived idea can stand against a fact," and I may add that no dogmatic assertion—no, not even the *ipse dixit* of the learned Bishop of Durham—can be suffered for one

moment to prevail against clear, logical proof based upon a careful examination of the collected facts. As to the medical language, if the authors (or translators) of the Septuagint were physicians, so was the author of the Acts—not otherwise. Their language is very much the same: whether physicians or not, they certainly were *Jews*—so also was the author of the Acts. Luke was NOT a *Jew*, but to the last an uncircumcised *Gentile*.

H. HEBER EVANS.

April 10th.

## THE IRISH CHURCH.

SIR,—I have no more wish to argue with "an Irish Churchman" than he has with me. The question can interest you and your readers only because Disestablishment may come on you, and force on you vestries and select vestries, like ours. I marvel that "an Irish Churchman" should, as he says, not have met "the farmers," in parochial vestries. My experience is that they alone are there, except that labourers also are present. Of course gentry, if there be any, will form a part—sometimes leading the others against the clergyman. There seems no qualification or restriction as to admission to these vestries. Wesleyans and others call themselves members of the Irish Church—in fact, I think all except Romanists assume that title. Communicating is not required, nor the contribution of a single penny to Sunday collection, diocesan, or general funds. I knew an instance where no one contributed anything to any of these purposes. Now this is most serious, as the whole rule of the Irish Church rests upon these vestries altogether, whilst these vestries may be directly antagonistic to every doctrine and practice of the Church. It is not my business to point out to you how you are to guard yourselves. I have only to state our case. *Experto crede.*

C. C. V.-G.

THE Bishop of Rochester has returned from the West Indies, and his health is much improved by his voyage. He will stay at Torquay till the end of the week, after which his address will be Selsdon Park, Croydon. His addresses at the Church Synod in Jamaica were greatly appreciated.

ARCHBISHOP TRENCH.—"M. D." writes:—"The late Archbishop Trench, who, before his elevation to the See of Dublin, was Dean of Westminster, was also, by virtue of this office, Dean of the Order of the Bath. Very soon after his appointment to the Deanery he went to preach at the adjoining church of St. Margaret's, and his old friend, the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce), went to hear him. While Trench was robing in the vestry before the service, he had to put on the badge of the Order of the Bath, the same which had been worn by his deceased predecessor, Dr. Buckland. 'I suppose'—said he, in a somewhat dolorous tone, as he hung the token round his neck—'I suppose I must take this as a *memento mori*.' 'Oh, no,' promptly replied the Bishop, who had himself also worn the order for a short time, as Dean of Westminster, before his elevation to the Bench, '*I* found its meaning to be *Resurgam*—I shall rise *again*.'"

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. Francis E., M.A., Rector of Bimbrooke, Lincolnshire; Vicar of East Farleigh, Kent.
Baker, Rev. James, M.A., Chaplain of the Royal Hants County Hospital.
Bennett, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Thornton Heath, Surrey.
Brown, Rev. Frederic Davy, Rector of Witnesham, Suffolk.
Buckworth, Rev. T. H., Rector of Belstone; Rector of East Worlington, Devon.
Cater, Rev. Joseph, Rector of Bisley.
Germon, Rev. Richard Medland, B.A., Curate of Clare Portion, Tiverton; Vicar of Withleigh.
Gladstone, Rev. H. Stewart, Curate of Mereworth, near Maidstone, Kent; Vicar of Great Barton, near Bury St. Edmund's, Suffolk.
Harkness, Rev. James Clarke, M.A., Vicar of Hawkley.
Harton, Rev. J. W., B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Penkhull.
Harvey, Rev. Charles Gilbert, M.A., Rector of Peper Harow.
Hawkins, Rev. R. McL., Rector of Tattingstone; Vicar of Christ Church, Brighton.
Hoare, Rev. Edward Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Chilworth.
Hodgson, Rev. T. E., M.A., Vicar of Darlington and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Durham Cathedral.
Iremonger, Rev. Edward Reginald, M.A., Vicar of Wherwell.
Kewley, Rev. W. H., Vicar of Oakley; Rector of Fittleton, Wilts.
Le Brun, Rev. John, Vicar of Alderney.
Lowndes, Rev. Jefferson, M.A., Assistant Master and Chaplain of the School, Derby; Senior Curate of St. George's, Basseterre, St. Kitts, and Head Master of the High School.
Mann, Rev. William Henry Galfridus, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Sheerness.
Marson, Rev. Charles Latimer, M.A., Rector of Orlestone, near Ashford, Kent.
Paul, Rev. F. W., Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Woodborough Road, Nottingham.
Rawlings, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Curate of Pitt Portion, Tiverton; Vicar of Cove.
Ridley, Rev. C. W., Vicar of St. Paul's, Heavitree, Liverpool.
Rivington, Rev. T., Curate-in-Charge of Great Snoring.
Rundle, Rev. William Dunstan, LL.M., Rector of Otterham, Cornwall; Rector of Little Hempston.
Sheppard, Rev. James Edgar, M.A., Sub-Dean of Her Majesty's Chapels Royal; Honorary Chaplain to the Queen.
Smith, Rev. William Wilton, M.A., Vicar of Cammeringham.
Stopford, Rev. Frederick Manners, M.A., Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty; Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.
Thew, Rev. F. S., M.A., Rector of Swafield, Norfolk.
Tovey, Rev. Duncan Crookes, M.A., Rector of Worplesdon.
Whistler, Rev. A. J., Chaplain to the *Hercules*.
Whitaker, Rev. W. E., B.A., Rector of Holcombe; Rector of Holcombe with Babington.
Wilson, Rev. Studholme, Curate of St. Michael's, Paddington; Rector of Burley, Hants.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cobb, Rev. John Francis, late of Spratton, Northampton, at 14, Calverley Park, Tunbridge Wells, on the 15th inst., aged 85.
Cotterill, Henry, Bishop of Edinburgh, at Manor Place, Edinburgh, on the 16th inst.
Cox, Rev. Thomas Charles, at Lathom Parsonage, Ormskirk, on the 13th inst., aged 39.
Hodgson, Rev. James, M.A., for thirty-three and a-half years Vicar of Bloxham, Oxon, on the 18th inst., Palm Sunday, aged 61.
Newbould, Rev. William Williamson, M.A., F.L.S., at Montague House, Kew, on the 16th inst., aged 67.
Ornsby, George, M.A., F.S.A., Vicar of Fishlake, and Canon of York, at Fishlake Vicarage, on the 17th inst., aged 77.
Rodgers, Rev. John Douglass, B.A., formerly Curate of Chobham, at Upper Norwood, on the 14th inst., aged 79.
Sharpe, Rev. Robert Matthew, Vicar of Anslow, Burton-on-Trent, on the 14th inst., aged 71.
Wilshere, Rev. Edward Chapman, M.A., Vicar of Willoughton for upwards of fourteen years, at Willoughton, suddenly, on the 14th inst., aged 68.
Woodd, Rev. Basil Kilvington, late Vicar of Bilton, Harrogate, and eldest son of Basil T. Woodd, Esq., of Conyngham Hall, Knaresborough, on the 16th inst., aged 43.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## PRAISE.

By Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Vicar of Warrenpoint, Co. Down.

Sermon Preached in Warrenpoint Church.

"I will bless the Lord at all times. His praise shall continually be in my mouth."—Psalm xxxiv. 1.

THERE are times when praise flows naturally and without effort from the lips of man. When we have escaped some great peril, when we have received some special blessing, when Providence seems as it were to have selected us particularly to be the recipients of His loving kindness, it is natural that thankfulness should well up in our hearts, and that thanksgiving should find utterance at our lips. When the fierce hunters of Esau had departed, and Jacob saw his herds and flocks unravaged, and his wives and children safe, it would have been strange if he had not felt thankful to the God who had so marvellously befriended him. When Israel came out of Egypt and crossed "upon dry land in the midst of the sea," and beheld the chariots and horsemen of Pharaoh swept away by the returning waters, it was natural that Miriam should lead with her timbrel the chant that burst from the grateful hearts of the women of Israel, "Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea." Or, in later times, when the people saw the stately edifice which the piety and munificence of Solomon had erected for the honour and worship of Jehovah, what wonder if they rejoiced and praised the Lord. But the text goes beyond this. It introduces a principle broader and deeper than this, for it teaches us that it is our duty and our privilege to praise God continually, at all times, under all circumstances. In order rightly to discharge this duty several things are absolutely necessary. If you would realise aright the meaning of the Psalmist, "I will bless the Lord at all times," you must first realise, as he did, the Fatherhood of a living, loving, and personal God. Too often our religion is a mere theory. We talk about God, but our God is an abstraction. Hence men so frequently attribute the blessings they enjoy to fortune, or chance, or good luck. You cannot feel grateful to an abstraction. You cannot love a dead law. At the root of all religion lies the grasp of a living personal God guiding all things, controlling all things, from the fate of an empire to the fall of a sparrow, or the colour of a hair. But we need something more than personality. We want to know how this great and terrible Being feels towards us; how we should feel in respect of Him.

We have not been left in ignorance on those points. Listen—"Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." Once realise this great truth, and then you will have no difficulty in crying with the Psalmist, "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless His holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits."

To feel grateful to an abstraction is impossible, and in order to offer acceptable thanksgiving, it is absolutely necessary that you should feel thankful, "I will bless the Lord at all times, His praise shall continually be in my mouth."

1. The duty of continual thanksgiving is clearly taught in the Word of God. It is Scriptural. Turn to the Book of Job. When calamity fell upon the patriarch, and stroke followed stroke in rapid succession; when his children had perished and his wealth had disappeared, the soul of Job fell back on God, and he cried, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord." When Satan insinuated doubts as to the sincerity of his religion, and challenged the Almighty to touch him in his own person, and when disease, horrible and loathsome, was added to calamities, Job said, "Shall we receive good at the hands of God, and shall we not receive evil?" (Job ii. 10.) Thankfulness is the key-note of the Psalms. It matters not how dark the cloud may be which envelops the Psalmist; though troubles thicken round his pathway, and enemies threaten to overwhelm him, though he feels like a man shut up in a deep dark dungeon, and the harp-notes as the strain begins are wailing and uncertain, and dirge-like, yet before the harp is laid aside the song swells into triumph, and closes with an ecstasy of praise. Let us take as an illustration Psalm lxix. What a terrible picture does it present of a soul persecuted and afflicted for conscience sake. It opens with a wail of intense agony—the cry of one abandoned and almost in despair, "Save me, O God, for the waters are come in unto my soul. I sink in deep mire where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me; I am weary of my crying, my throat is dried; mine eyes fail while I wait for my God." . . . "They that sit in the gate speak against me, and I was the song of the drunkards." . . . "Reproach hath broken my heart, and I am full of heaviness, and I looked for some to take pity, but there was none, and for comforters, but I found none." Here assuredly is a picture painted in dark and lurid colours—a picture of woe, and distress, and suffering, yet the cloud has a silver lining, and above the storm rests the rainbow of hope and trust. The Psalm that begins with a dirge closes with an

anthem. "I will praise the name of God with a song, and will magnify Him with thanksgiving. . . . Let the Heaven and earth praise Him; the seas and everything that moveth therein."

It is not easy for the Church to praise God when He calls upon her to pass through the refining fire of sorrow and tribulation, yet we know that not only does tribulation promote purification, but it also produces praise. The loftiest notes of praise have been struck in the night of sorrow. Listen to Habakkuk—he saw in prophetic vision the land desolate, the glory departed, and the Pagan triumphant, until he trembled at the sight of the ruin of his people, yet he cries—"Though the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines, the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat, the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls, yet I will rejoice in the Lord; I will joy in the God of my salvation." (Hab. iii. 17, 18.)

True thankfulness leads to trust; if you trust God fully, if you realise His love and tenderness, and fatherly care for the children of men, then you will know that afflictions do not come by chance, but are sent by One who knows our frame, sympathises with our weakness, and suits the various dispensations of His providence to our human necessities. Again, take the case of St. Paul. If any man had cause for anxiety surely he had. His whole life was a constant struggle—persecutions from without, poverty, contempt, hatred, jealousies, a stake in the flesh, the care of all the churches, disunions, waning love among the brethren, heresies, false teachers, journeyings hither and thither, arrests and imprisonments, a life which resembled a living death, yet the burden of the Apostle's ministry is joy—"Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say rejoice." "Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Eph. v. 20). When he entered Rome with the horrors of a trial before Nero full in view, yet when he found brethren waiting to receive him at Appii Forum, "he thanked God and took courage." If ever men were in trouble, Paul and Silas were on that night when the magistrates cast them into prison at Philippi. It was the inner prison, some foul, dark, noisome den, perhaps not much better than the dungeon of Malchiah (Jer. xxxviii. 6). Their backs smarting from the stripes, their feet fast in the stocks, yet even then they raised to God a hymn of praise and the prisoners heard them. Yea, and God heard in heaven His dwelling-place, and answered by the earthquake that shook the prison to its foundations, and by the outpouring of His Spirit that shook the hold of Satan on captive souls.

"I will bless the Lord at all times, His praise shall continually be in my mouth."

We have seen that continual thanksgiving is eminently Scriptural, we shall proceed to prove that—

(2) It is also reasonable.—God is the centre of Creation. What was the object of it? St. John tells us in the anthem of the four and twenty elders—"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power, for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created." In order, therefore, to fulfil the functions of creation, it is necessary to praise God. For He says by the Psalmist—"Whoso offereth praise, he glorifieth me, and to him that ordereth his conversation aright will I shew the salvation of God." We have also the example of inanimate nature. When this world appeared in its beauty, "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy" (Job xxxviii. 7), and ever since nature has been full of melodies proclaiming with unceasing voice the praises of God. The heavens have declared His glory, sun and moon, showers and dew, snow and vapours, mountains and hills, seas and floods—

Still choiring to the young-eyed cherubims,

have cried, "Bless ye the Lord; praise Him and magnify Him for ever." And is it reasonable, when the stones of the building are crying out, and the beams from the timber answer, that man, the priest of the temple of creation should remain silent? Look back and consider all the way by which the Lord hath hitherto led thee, the unmerited blessings bestowed upon thee, the deliverances, the mercies, the comforts which have marked every step of that onward way, then say, Hast thou no occasion to give thanks? What has been your special merit, that you should have been selected for special blessing? Yet you were born in a Christian land, within sound of the Church-going bell, within reach of the ordinances of religion, within the circle wherein is felt the power of a preached Gospel! Think of the parents by whom you were carefully nurtured, the mother's influence, the happy peaceful home—have you no cause for thanksgiving?

Where are the friends of your youth? Many of them have disappeared. Their lives, like wrecks, strew the shores of the ocean of life, some cut off by disease, some by intemperate habits, some overpowered by some masterful passion—And you? You are this day mercifully preserved, a living monument of the goodness of God! Is it reasonable that you should defraud God of His due by withholding your praise?

But God has done more for you than this. He has redeemed you by the offering of His own well-beloved Son. Has redemption no charms for you? Has the love of Christ no beauty in your eyes? The Apostle thought otherwise, for the contemplation of it draws from him the burst of praise—"Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift."

Is it reasonable that men should neglect to praise God, yet expect that He will continue to answer their prayers? But how rarely do we find those who call upon the Church for her public intercession on their behalf when they are dangerously ill, coming forward to return their public thanksgiving when the intercession has availed? Is it reasonable to attend Divine service Sunday after Sunday, and week after week, yet neglect that which is the object of public worship? But we are taught in the Exhortation at the daily service "That we assemble and meet together before God to render thanks for the great benefits that we have received at His hands, and to set forth His most worthy praise." Have you ever contrasted your lot with that of multitudes of your fellow men? How many hardly know the very meaning of good health? They are victims of excruciating pain, of lingering diseases. In what respect are you deserving of a different treatment? How many suffer the pangs of unforgiven, unrepented sin? How many are in danger from the still worse misery of sin unfelt!—"Dead in trespasses and sins." Have you no cause to thank God for "the means of grace and the hope of glory," for pardon of sin, for redemption through Christ Jesus, for deliverance from fear of death and from the dominion of Satan? St. Paul, when he cries, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" answers, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. vii. 24-25).

When we contemplate God's pardoning love, well may we exclaim:—"Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits; who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases" (Psalm ciii. 3).

If we have realised the Fatherhood of God, and appropriated by living personal faith the salvation that is in Christ Jesus our Lord, well may we rejoice. Angels rejoice in heaven over a sinner repenting. Can you say: "O Lord, I will praise Thee; though Thou wast angry with me, Thine anger is turned away, and Thou comfortest me."

Praise is the atmosphere of heaven; sin and sorrow and death have no place there. It is a world of love and holiness, of cloudless joy, of cloudless glory. Therefore it is a world of unceasing praise. Is it reasonable to wish to go there, yet to feel indifferent as to possessing the state of mind necessary to make existence there tolerable? When Isaiah beheld the glory of Christ, the choirs of heaven were engaged in chanting the praises of God. "One cried unto another and said, 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts: the whole earth is full of His glory.'" And the anthem swelled until the foundations trembled beneath the feet of the seer, and "the house was filled with smoke" (Is. vi.). So it is in St. John's vision (Rev. iv.); when the four living creatures chant the same anthem, they are answered by the four and twenty elders, who fall down before the throne and worship Him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created." And when the choirs of angels are swelled by the addition of God's elect gathered out of every nation and tongue and people, there rises from that mighty multitude which no man could number, the song of praise, "Salvation unto our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." They have won the victory, they have fought the battle, they have vanquished Satan, they have been redeemed, sanctified, glorified. They stand before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes. Well may they raise an anthem of praise to Him who bought them with His blood, but as the last strains of that anthem die away the response peals from angels and elders and living creatures: "Amen. Blessing and glory and wisdom and thanksgiving and honour and power and might be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen."

Such is the worship of the heavenly city. Yet many people talk of going to heaven, and perhaps think they are in a fair way of preparing for it, who have little sympathy with God's praises in the earthly temple, whose thanksgivings are cold and slovenly and lifeless and spiritless. How few really realise what they are saying when they use the words put into their mouths by our Church: "Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts; heaven and earth are full of Thy glory; glory be to Thee, O Lord Most High. Amen."

(3.) Praise is Christ-like.—One example shall suffice. We cannot conceive a more sorrowful scene than that which marked the close of the ministry of Jesus of Nazareth when He kept the Passover with His disciples. The shadow of the Cross, deepening as the end drew near, fell darkly across the scene. The treachery of Judas; the falsehood of Peter; the inability of all to enter into and sympathise with the views of their Master; the horrible anticipations of public exposure, shame, obloquy, and torture; the Agony in the Garden; the brutal violence of the mob; the pains of death upon the Cross; all these and more which we cannot understand were present to the mind of the Son of Man. But when the Supper was ended, "when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives." What was it? The Great Hallel—the 118th Psalm. The Master looked beyond the Cross and saw death the gate of life, beyond humiliation and saw glory and honour and immortality won through suffering, beyond the darkness and loneliness of the present right into

the face of God, and saw there love and sympathy and unutterable tenderness. What was the anthem? Listen: "O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good, because His mercy endureth for ever. Let Israel now say that His mercy endureth for ever. Let the house of Aaron now say that His mercy endureth for ever. Let them now that fear the Lord say that His mercy endureth for ever." It was in the strength of that trust, the strength born of loving praise, that our Blessed Lord "endured the Cross, despising the shame." Would you do good work for Him Who has done so much for you? Cultivate a thankful spirit, and let your thankfulness lead to praise. It is impossible to over-estimate the injury inflicted on religion by those gloomy, discontented Christians, who are for ever sitting under the "juniper tree," for ever morose, as though they did well to be angry. "Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say rejoice." Let thankfulness rule in your hearts: it shall produce in your lives a perpetual sunshine in whose warmth and brightness all Christian graces shall spring up and come to perfection. True religion is not sentiment alone, nor is it mere external service. Therefore, it must be your constant endeavour "to show forth your thankfulness in your lives," by obedience, by purity, by temperance, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand, and on the left by piety towards God and charity towards your fellow man. Thus shall your sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving rise up to God and find acceptance at His hands: Your way may be dark and the road rugged, yet your God is He "Who giveth songs in the night." Your sins may be like a sore burden too heavy to be borne, yet His message to your soul is: "Fear not, I have redeemed thee." The Law may sound in your ears like peals of awful thunder, yet another sound is heard—the voice of One Who says—"The joy of the Lord is your strength" (Neh. viii. 10). "Fear not, I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name, thou art Mine" (Isaiah xliii. 1). May God by the influence of His ever-blessed Spirit enable you from the heart to answer: "I will bless the Lord at all times, His praise shall ever be in my mouth. Amen."

## A SUGGESTED EIRENICON FOR CHRISTENDOM.

By the Rev. RICHARD H. HAWKES, M.A.

Paper read before the London Junior Clergy Society in the Chapter House, St. Paul's, Tuesday, April 13th, 1886.

Even as a contribution towards the great and precious cause of Catholic reunion, it may be allowed to offer suggestions for a truce between brethren, and a practical eirenicon which might ultimately lead to the unity, which is good for the Church, and for all who profess and call themselves Christians.

Every one who is moderately acquainted with the principles of Church order must allow that the present state of Christendom is extremely anomalous, that not only is intercommunion suspended, but that mutual encroachment takes place. The position of our English congregations on the Continent is very irregular—to use a mild term—as indeed is the position in England of the Greek and Latin congregations. It is surely very indecorous for Anglican priests residing in a French or Italian diocese to be altogether dependent on the Bishop of London; more than indecorous for the Latins in England to have their quasi-dioceses and schismatic bishops even claiming English territorial titles and jurisdiction, as in Westminster, Southwark, Salford, and Nottingham, whereas, for the first twelve years of Elizabeth's reign every one resorted to the parish churches. This peace was only broken in 1570, by the Bull of Pius V. deposing Elizabeth, and by the Papal intrusion of Latin priests, and the withdrawal of the persons under Roman obedience to the obscure and newly-raised Latin altars. Then came the creation of Roman sees *in partibus infidelium*, and in 1850 the pretension to parcel out England and Wales into dioceses, and to assign our Christian land to the jurisdiction of Wiseman and other Latin prelates. This invasion was at the time excellently thus characterised by an English scholar and divine—

> Cum Sapiente Pius nostras juravit in aras,
> Impius heu! Sapiens, insipiensque Pius!

But let us take the case of Anglicans on the Continent to-day. Their position is very unhappy. Unless they submit to Rome (in a Latin country), they cannot receive the sacraments, and therefore they are dependent on the ministration of Anglican chaplains for the chief means of grace. Otherwise, they must content themselves with worship in the Catholic churches of the country, be it Russia or Italy.

At present so large are the English "colonies" in foreign countries, and so numerous the chaplains (whose services at least should often be more church-like than they are) that special Episcopal control has been desired for them. Here a very important question is raised. It is *primâ facie* irregular for the Bishop of London or his Commissary to exercise a literary "exorbitant" jurisdiction by licensing or confirming within the diocese of a lawful bishop without permission; still more is it irregular for a bishop consecrated *ad hoc*—thus following the bad Roman example—to reside within such diocese, and therein, or even beyond it, exercise his office. Thus about 1824 Bishop Luscombe was set down in Paris to overlook his compatriots; and since then an Anglican bishop has been put over Gibraltar, Malta, and even French and Italian congregations, ministering even in Rome, and eliciting the remark of the Roman Pontiff, that till then he had not known his city to be within the diocese of Gibraltar. Surely it is not for an Anglican prelate to speak like an universal patriarch *urbi et orbi*. Similarly without principle was the unhappy "Jerusalem Bishopric," founded most glaringly on intrusion into Eastern dioceses and invasion of patriarchal rights. Can we wonder if Greek and Latin rites are set up without permission in England?

As to the Anglican chaplaincies on the Continent,

they are held under licence of the Bishop of London, who deputed Bishop Titcomb some time ago to visit those in Northern Europe. and afterwards to hold at Pau a conference of Anglican chaplains. Granted that Confirmation can only be administered by some travelling bishop to the children of our "colonies" —very numerous in Paris, Brussels, etc.—how can the superintendence of such separated congregations and their ministers be conducted on sound principles? Again, how can those foreigners residing specially in England obtain the ministrations of their own clergy, Greek or Latin, without schism; and how can order be reached, to some extent at least, with all charity. Bishop Andrewes says that "*Gloria deo*" precedes "*Pax in terrâ.*"

Let us see if without undue rigour, with allowance for the unhappy breaches of unity now continued through centuries—with all Christian reasonableness and mutual forbearance—some *modus vivendi* may not be reached. *Beati pacifici.*

Newman has said (preface to the "*Via Media*"): —"No measure could be theologically in error which is absolutely and undeniably necessary for the unity and sanctity and peace of the Church.

An anonymous writer (*Church Review*, March 12th, 1886), has said:—"There sometimes arises a great hope in loyal hearts that the present occupant of the Chair of St. Peter, who has so much of the spirit of Gregory the Great, will himself hold out an olive branch. Why should he not make his Pontificate glorious and a blessing to the age by doing so? For he would only be acting like a true son of the great Universal Father, who said to men in old times, 'Come, let us reason together.'"

Archbishop Murray (a Roman prelate) wrote about 1825, "There need be no irreconcileable difference between the Churches, if only Church of England people were true to their Prayer Book. A glorious crown will be laid up for him to whom the power and opportunity are given, and who wills, with the Holy Spirit's help, to bring about the reunion of Christendom; and what a priceless privilege it will be to stand with brothers long divided, shoulder to shoulder, beneath the banner of the Cross, shouting in unison the old battle-cry, *Si Deus nobiscum, quis contra nos?* The call to sow the seed that has sprung up and blossomed, and brought forth fruit abundantly, was answered by good men and true in the early part of this century; are there no good and true soldiers of the Cross who will at the close of it come forth boldly and show us how we may crown their labour in the only way in which it can be fitly crowned by the reunion of Christendom?"

Let us see what can be done as an eirenicon for the present distress, that our Jerusalem may be a city of peace, that Ephraim may no more envy Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim (Isaiah xi. 13).

First, the existing varieties of doctrine and practice which have grown up in the course of long years must be realised. Human nature cannot always be conformed to a theoretically perfect system. Archbishop Whately had a sensible saying on rigid uniformity which should be remembered, "Wide will wear; tight will tear."

It can hardly be that those accustomed to the elaborate and long-drawn rites of the Eastern Church, or to the varied ceremonial of Rome, should conform to our much simpler order of worship, rendered moreover in the vernacular of our island, which, widespread as it is, cannot equal in dignity or antiquity the Greek and Latin tongues in which the most venerable liturgies have so long been offered. A striking instance of our involuntary resort to those ancient tongues is found in our frequent use of the terms "*Sanctus*," "*Gloria*," "*Benedictus*," and "*Agnus*" (not to speak of the familiar terms "*Te Deum*," "*Magnificat*," "*Benedicite*," and the Latin title of the Psalms given in our Psalter)—of the Greek "*Kyrie Eleison*," remarkably adapted into Latin offices—and of the still more ancient Hebrew phrases, Hosanna, Hallelujah, and Sabaoth, which have become the property of the Christian Church. So much for ancient usage embedded in our present life. As Isaac Williams writes in *The Cathedral*, our foreign sisters may have a more gorgeous dress than we wear in our dull and sober climate. Content as we may be with our homely rites and simple Prayer Book, we cannot expect Spaniards and Italians, Greeks and Asiatics, to willingly accept our own insular services.

The key-note of such a *modus vivendi* must be the recognition of the Diocesan Bishop's office and jurisdiction in each Christian land. This, at present, our Latin brethren in England are not very likely to concede. But several years ago, when Mr. Archer Gurney was undertaking an English chaplaincy in Paris, he waited on the archbishop of that diocese and obtained his sanction for ministration to the English colony. This was a right and Christian step, creditable alike to the Anglican priest and the Latin prelate. Perhaps also may be mentioned the visit of the Eastern Archbishop Lycurgus to Lincoln a few years since, when he took part in the cathedral service at the request of the late venerable bishop; also the blessing given on request by the present Archbishop of Canterbury to the new Armenian Church in London; while in 1812, Henry Martyn was buried at Tocat with archiepiscopal honours by express order of the Catholicos Ephraim, and in 1814 Catholicos Hierces at Bagdad attended several dying Englishmen, and administered to them Holy Communion, which facts were mentioned in the Anglican church of St. Stephen, Calcutta, by the chaplain, the Rev. A. S. Dyer, preaching in the presence of the Armenian Archbishop of Cilicia. (*Church Times*, December 11th, 1885.)

Is it too much to hope that friendly negotiations may be opened between the three branches of the Holy Catholic Church for such mutual toleration and adjustment of internal rule, based on acceptance of Apostolic succession and the three creeds?

But entire re-union is not now so much an object as an Eirenicon.

Though even on such points of difference as the *Filioque*, the marriage of the clergy, and the mode of baptism, East and West might be reconciled; for, though baptism by immersion is the Eastern rule, the Western mode of affusion is now recognised by Constantinople, following the Holy Governing Synod of St. Petersburgh, and Western converts are not now, as formerly, rebaptised. (Dollinger, p. 531.)

Each bishop would, then, authorize the use of the peculiar or foreign rites by the adherents thereof living in his diocese, himself not interfering in their internal concerns, nor suffering their interference with their fellow Christians. It would be stipulated that the tolerated foreign clergy did not proselytise nor claim state recognition or Diocesan jurisdiction. In a word, they would be tolerated instead of being *ipso facto* excommunicated or out of communion, and

the evil of ecclesiastical encroachments, trespass, and *anomia* would be stayed. One or more Vicars General would preside over the foreign congregations, and obtain for them confirmation by arrangement. The supply of foreign clergy might also be obtained from without; but all needless intrusion of a foreign episcopate should be restrained. This point of episcopal ministration requires, however, much care and regulation; and, in particular, the *status* of existing Latin Bishops in England would call for much forbearance on both sides. The Latin Communion in England, too much ruled by "an insolent and aggressive faction," would, indeed, be reduced to a much humbler position than she now claims, and her aggressive attitude would be exchanged for one of quiet existence. In London, the Latin and Greek colonies would then be recognised as "variations" from the Diocesan rule, in Paris the Greek and Anglican; in Moscow the Latin and Anglican rites would severally be authorised for their respective adherents, while the bishop of the diocese abstained from exercising control, and was recognised rather as *de jure* than *de facto Episcopus*.

Such would be an anomaly open to animadversion, but apparently it would tend to peace—that great boon so long lost to the Church. On Anglican, and probably on Eastern sides, some concessions might fairly be made. The great difficulty would evidently be with the great Latin Communion, so long stern and inexorable, "sitting like a queen," imperial and imperious, requiring to be approached with a *Confiteor* and a *Miserere*. "The great stumbling-block and real hindrance to any understanding in the eyes of all Easterns is the Papacy in the form which it has assumed since the time of Gregory VII., of an absolute spiritual and temporal dominion over the whole Christian world!"—(Dollinger, Lect. iii.). Yet "before honour is humility," as has well been observed. Will she, in the interests of truth and peace, abate her literally exorbitant jurisdiction, her undue claims on the obedience of the Christian world?

An unknown writer (*Church Review*, March 12th, 1886) has lately said, "There is the *crux* of Anglican orders. Everything that could be done and written to prove them invalid has been done by those who wish to prove them so, and with what result? Skilled theologians, and a yearly-increasing number of intelligent Roman Catholics believe as firmly in the validity of Anglican orders as English Churchmen do. Others, as Newman, consider them 'doubtful,' but even he will not go so far as to say that they are invalid." And Dollinger (Lect. iv.) says that the English Church retained the Episcopate, and with it the succession and ordination.

Still the prayers and practical efforts of all members of Christ's Church should be enlisted in the work of abating strife and promoting unity. Even Utopian aspirations may bring forth good fruit in God's good time. Let us "seek peace and ensue it."

Dr. Dollinger (First Lecture) estimates the Christian portion of the human family as about 350 millions, *i.e.*, about 30 per cent. of the world's inhabitants. He reckons the orthodox Greek or Eastern Churches at 75 millions in Russia, Turkey, and Greece, besides the closely related Nestorians and the Monophysites who are in three National Churches, the Armenian, the Abyssinian, and the Coptic in Egypt. As to the Uniates in Poland, who from 1588 were allowed by Rome to retain Eastern externals of worship under Rome instead of Constantinople, they have been absorbed again into the Russian Church, finally in 1839, except a few in the diocese of Ohelm; while in Galicia, South Hungary, and Transylvania there are still Uniate churches, with two and a-half millions of souls.

He reckons the Latin Church at 180 millions, but does not give the numbers of the Anglican, though he counts the Lutherans in Germany, Scandinavia, and Eastern coasts of Russia at thirty millions, and the Reformed in Switzerland, the Netherlands, Scotland, and parts of Germany and Hungary. To these must of course be added the Protestants in America and elsewhere.

Dollinger says "that the time will come (or has come) when the Petrine and Pauline Churches will develop into a Johannean Church; or, as was said in mediæval times, to the period of the Father and the Son will succeed the age of the Holy Ghost. And this will come about by the existing Churches being content to learn and receive of one another, and to impart to one another their peculiar possessions and privileges, and thus enter into the noblest community of goods; but above all by thus setting a higher value on the creeds and doctrines which they have inherited, and which they confess in common, than on what divides them. That Christ, the Church's Founder, desired and enjoined its unity is clear. In His Eucharistic Prayer we read: "That they all may be one; that as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me" (St. John xvii. 21) And here be it noted that this unity of Christians is itself to serve as the means to a further end; it is to be a testimony for the world in general, and for all nations, of the truth and divinity of the teaching of Christ." "Therefore," continues Dollinger (Lecture ii.), "everyone who values the name of Christian should daily pray to God for a fresh outpouring of the spirit of unity, that we may keep a new Pentecost of enlightenment, peace, and brotherly love." "The Latin Church," he says (Lecture iii.), "in negotiations with Protestants, must never act without reference to the Eastern Church; or, still better, in concert with its members, or the attempt to bridge over one chasm might widen and deepen another no less deplorable and displeasing to God. And to leave out the English Church would be to drop a link no less indispensable than precious in the chain we are seeking to reunite."

And again (Lecture vi.): "The body of the Church, one in origin, has in course of time, through the sin of man and by Divine permission, become divided into three great branches—outwardly separated, but inwardly united—which, when the right time is come, will grow together again into one tree, overshadowing the world with its foliage."

Finally, may we have part in that most musical Beatitude, "*Beati pacifici, quoniam filii Dei vocabuntur*," remembering that in the Angelic hymn, "*Pax in terrâ*," is promised "*hominibus bonæ voluntatis*."

---

On the 21st ult. the Rev. Henry Blunt, rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn, and Rural Dean, was unanimously elected president of Sion College, in the room of the Rev. J. F. Kitto, instituted to the vicarage of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 1, 1886.

## FREE TRADE.

WE admitted a discussion on this important subject in the hope that it might administer to the removal of the present depression in agriculture, and in many other manufactures. In *theory* we agree with the Free Traders, and if other manufacturing nations were Free Traders, their arguments would be irresistible; but they are not, and it behoves us, therefore, to estimate and provide against the practical effects of a one-sided Free Trade. "B." is clearly right in holding that foreign countries pay all the import duty they choose to levy on our manufactured goods, and not we ourselves; but such duty acts in restraint of our manufacturers, and is therefore *indirectly* injurious to us. This would not be the case, we imagine, with export duties, did we place them upon coal and iron, of which we send very large quantities to assist foreigners to compete with us in our own and other markets. We have always felt that for fiscal reasons, quite independent of Free Trade theories, it would be prudent to place an excise duty on the consumption of these articles, which are the "stored-up" wealth of our country, and which are diminishing year by year. If, for instance, an excise duty of 1s. a ton were levied on the 150,000,000 tons of coal we yearly export, it would produce, with little or no expense for collecting, £7,500,000, which might and ought to be applied to the reduction of the National Debt. Our financiers prefer to levy an income-tax, the most immoral of all taxes, which it costs millions to collect, and which at 2d. in the pound is said only to pay the cost of collection. The question for our statesmen and economists to determine is whether it be possible to provide any remedy or set-off for the *indirect* injury which foreign tariffs undoubtedly inflict upon us. "Reciprocity" has been suggested, but the thorough-going doctrinaire Free Trader argues with some reason that it is fallacious, because the foreigner, by his hostile tariff, does not tax our goods, but only his own subjects who use them, and that it would be no remedy for the *indirect* injury our trade suffers from the foreign tariff for us to retaliate and make everything foreign dearer to ourselves than it is, and, by still further crippling our trade, make those from whom we now purchase absolutely incompetent to purchase from us at all. In other words, they allege that import taxes are like cutting off our nose to spite our face. Hostile tariffs do the imposers of them direct, and those against whom they are imposed only *indirect*, mischief. Some persons wrongly think that you can make foreigners pay your own import duties. You cannot, it is quite impossible. We are inclined to believe that compensation might be made to our producers for this *indirect* injury from foreign tariffs by imposing export duties on some of the raw materials that foreigners buy of us, and if it was levied as an excise duty for revenue, it would not contravene the axioms and principles of Free Trade. In dealing with the question, it must not be overlooked that many countries have attained to great material prosperity under protective tariffs. The only solid argument, besides the repeal of the Decalogue, for Home Rule in Ireland is that under the protective duties of her last Parliament she was very prosperous, and sold to England her corn, her cattle, her woollens, and calicoes, and muslins, and silks, and cottons, and carpets, and blankets, and flannels. "Can those who now hear me deny," said Mr. Forster, speaking in the House of Commons in 1880, "that, since the period of 1782 Ireland has risen in civilisation, in wealth, in manufactures, in a greater proportion and with a more rapid progress than any other country in Europe?" This prosperity is attributed to the protection of Irish industries, which protection after the Union was gradually withdrawn, and totally ceased about 1825. The population and general prosperity of three provinces have certainly diminished since then, but whether *post hoc propter hoc* we are unable to say. Belgium also, with no natural advantages of soil or climate, has for eighty or a hundred years enjoyed the strictest protection; and what is the result? Such a growth and development of manufacturing and agricultural industries as the world has never seen equalled. With the densest population in Europe, she can still export food; whilst her protected manufacturing industries have overflown the soil, and she exports relatively more than any nation in the world.

CANON ELIOT, vicar of Holy Trinity, Bournemouth, has accepted the canonry of Windsor, rendered vacant by the death of the Rev. Lord Wriothesley Russell.

ERRATUM.—By some mistake in the monthly list of Hymns Ancient and Modern in our last issue, No. 323 is given as the last hymn for the evening of May 30th. It should be No. 223.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### THE PRESSING QUESTION OF THE HOUR.

SIR,—It is useless, I fear, to prolong a controversy in which no attempt is made by "B." or "H. W." to meet the arguments adduced against unrestricted competition at the cost of labour and productive capital, but only the fact is alleged that a certain progress is discernible in the condition of society, which is put down at once to the credit of free trade. The plain fact is as established by the most undeniable statistics that Protectionist countries have advanced in a higher and quicker ratio than our own comparatively free trade community. I cannot occupy your space by a deliberate demonstration of this fact, but must content myself with referring my antagonists to the *data* so carefully put together by Lord Penzance. As to "B.'s" strange assertion that List and the German school of economists have devoted more attention to the distribution than to the production of wealth, it runs precisely counter to the fact, and the best answer to it will be furnished by an extract from List's great work on national political economy, as rendered by Mr. Sampson S. Lloyd :—

"That may be wisdom in national economy, which would be folly in private economy, or *vice versâ;* and owing to the very simple reason that a tailor is no nation and a nation no tailor —that one family is something very different from a community of families —that one house is something very different from a large national territory. Nor does the individual, merely by understanding his own interests best, and by striving to further them, if left to his own devices, always further the interests of the community. We ask those who occupy the benches of justice whether they do not frequently have to send individuals to the tread-mill on account of their excess of inventive power, and of their all too great industry. Robbers, thieves, smugglers, and cheats know their own local circumstances and conditions extremely well, and pay the most active attention to their business; but it by no means follows therefrom, that society is in the best condition when such individuals are least restrained in the exercise of their private industry. In a thousand cases the power of the State is compelled to impose restrictions on private industry. For similar reasons, the State is not merely justified in imposing, but bound to impose regulations and restrictions on commerce for the best interests of the nation. (Pp. 165-167.) It is a sophism, arrived at by confounding the theory of mere values with that of the power of production, when the popular (or free trade) school infers from the doctrine that the wealth of the nation is merely the aggregate of the wealth of all individuals in it, and that the private interest of every individual is better able than all State regulations to incite to production and the accumulation of wealth, *the conclusion* that the national industry would prosper best if only every individual were left undisturbed in the occupation of accumulating wealth. The point in question is not that of increasing the amount of the value of exchanges by commercial restrictions, *but of increasing the amount of its productive powers.*" (169-170.)

The whole object of List is to show that a nation is a great whole, and that true political economy can never sever health and wealth, or set aside moral, political, and equitable considerations. But my honourable antagonists are absolutely at war with me and List as to the object and meaning of political economy. "B." says true political economy is not an art or science with the object of producing wealth for its end. This is precisely what it is, I must venture to maintain, understanding by wealth the general well-being and prosperity, moral, mental, and physical, of the community; and it is the main object of List's great work to establish this thesis. Distribution is in his eyes secondary, though important. The all-important matter is healthful productivity, manufacturing and agricultural, at once and together.

Let me now turn to the most pressing question of the hour—the proposed disruption of Ireland from Britain under the nefarious scheme brought forward by the present Prime Minister, and the in my eyes absolutely monstrous attempt to buy off and get rid of the whole body of landlords and gentry out of Ireland, substituting for them a large body of ignorant and deluded tenant farmers, henceforth to be sole possessors of the soil. It is impossible to conceive of more ruinous and insane propositions than these, and the first duty of Parliament and of every loyal citizen is manfully to meet them with a decided and contemptuous negative, and dismiss our incapable and practically effete ministers from power.

None the less do I believe that ultimately the force of things will render a measure of local legislation both feasible and desirable for all three kingdoms, consolidating their essential unity. In your own columns, and many others, expression has been given to what appears to me the most reasonable scheme as yet proposed—granting local chambers, upper and lower, Lords and Commons, to the three kingdoms, (1.) England and Wales on no account to be rent asunder; (2.) Scotland, and (3.) Ireland to sit for two months for all purposes of local legislation. previous to the meeting of the Imperial Parliament, to sit for four months and preside over the destinies of the Empire.

Of course the pressing need is that of Ireland, now in danger of practical destruction. Instead of driving the nobility and gentry of that country from the land, the one thing needful is that they should take their right place at Dublin as representatives of the interests of capital, rank, and education, as also of the Protestant minority of the nation, a million and a half of loyal and valuable citizens.

It is surely monstrous to suppose that because numbers are allowed to be represented in the upper chambers, or House of Commons, therefore all power should henceforth be centralised in the one numerical majority. This would be a complete surrender of the first principle of the British Constitution, a division of forces, and tend to national and speedy ruin. In Ireland, above all, the introduction of such a novelty would be absolutely destructive. It is wonderful that any man in his right mind should be found to propose or support so insane and revolutionary a scheme.

ARCHER GURNEY.

7, Keble Terrace, Oxford,
April 26, 1886.

### THE LARGER HOPE.

SIR,—I am glad to observe that Mr. Edmund Lawrence does not uphold your reviewer in his avowed

reticence on a grand topic, which he admits to be important truth. It does not appear to me that the reasons given by the reviewer are convincing.

I submit that ministers of religion ought to preach on the different classes of texts. Those which exhibit the evil of sin, and its fearful consequences in this life and the next, ought to engage a large amount of their attention. But surely the numerous passages which seem to indicate that light and love will vanquish all darkness and malignity, ought to be set forth with earnest and grateful appreciation. I have put down twenty-five of such texts, and enclose them herewith.

Mr. Edmund Lawrence refers to free will as being a fatal obstacle to universal happiness. It seems marvellous to me that men of high intelligence have been maintaining, and still maintain, practically, the opinion that the Creator is either unable or unwilling to correct the most serious and even ruinous defects in the faculties of His creatures. Such a notion appears to me opposed to reason, to the great facts of human life, and to the declarations of the sacred volume. The assertion of Dr. Pusey, that the dignity of humanity would be violated by Divine interference for the purpose of correcting the perversity of the will, is calculated to make one wish that the barren honour of possessing the power to maintain immovable tenacity in wrong thoughts and feelings, had not been conferred on man. Calvin denied the freedom of the will. The author of the "Reign of Law" says, "The will of the lower animals is as free as ours." The author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" says, "Emotion, volition, thought itself, are functions of the brain." If I understand Mr. Lawrence rightly, he thinks all created beings will retain the power, throughout time and eternity, to choose evil rather than good. Consequently there will be endless instability and uncertainty among all orders of intelligent beings, including those who are called saints in heaven.

Spinoza indicated that the only possible freedom for intelligent beings is conformity with truth. Our Saviour said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It is stated in the Bible, "God created man in His own image." That affords grounds for a surmise, that all spiritual essences are germs, capable of being developed into a likeness to God. Progressive development towards that likeness can alone create a sense of well-being and happiness. That which retards it must always produce dissatisfaction and pain, which become a means of enlightenment and discipline. As spiritual essences become more and more conformed to God, instability and uncertainty will diminish until they disappear. There is no possible freedom for created beings, except in conformity to God, who is Light and who is Love. The doctrine of regeneration seems plainly to imply Divine interference of the most important nature.

Mr. Lawrence apparently holds the doctrine of "eternal punishment or perdition," but objects to such designations as "barbarities of endless duration," and "horrors and incongruities far beyond the most ferocious conceptions of the heathen." It would be interesting if he were to define what he understands by eternal punishment, and what effect he thinks a criminal population of endless depravity, malignity, and misery would have on the welfare of the universe, and on the condition of those who are called saints. In this life we feel, in spite of our imperfection and selfishness, that we must strive to relieve sorrow and suffering, and to counteract vice and crime.

Mr. Lawrence says truly that the doctrine of "the larger hope" is not new. It seems to have been an open question before the time of Augustine, and to have been proclaimed openly by eminent men among the Fathers. The system of terrorism against it, which prevailed subsequently, and is not yet extinct, was apparently unknown in the centuries immediately succeeding the Apostolic age.

J. B.

Surbiton, 19th April, 1886.

---

SIR,—Mr. Lawrence, writing in the PULPIT of the 10th inst., expresses his belief as to the Larger Hope thus:—"Seeing men to be endowed with a freedom of choice between good and evil, it is a logical contradiction in terms that the existence of evil should ever cease to be possible; and that if it cannot cease to be possible, its extermination is impossible."

I have nothing to say against the logic of this argument, but can Mr. Lawrence perceive what it involves? If it proves anything, it proves that evil cannot be extinguished, but must last for ever, not only in the Universe, but in the individual;—that is to say, if the individual man is, or is to be made, immortal, which I presume Mr. Lawrence believes. Now surely the hope of the world to come, as taught in Holy Scripture, includes our perfect purification from sin.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, April 19, 1886.

## THE BLACK RUBRIC.

SIR,—"Jupiter sometimes nods," and your correspondent "Presbyter," who acts as a final court of appeal, has nodded very perceptibly in his last letter. He ignores the history of the Black Rubric. This Rubric, which had been removed by Elizabeth, was restored at the last Revision, and the words "corporal presence" were substituted for "real and essential presence." The inference from this is that adoration of a real and essential presence is not forbidden, while that of a corporal presence is. "Presbyter," therefore, goes much too far, and quite beyond his book, when he says this Rubric "implies the denial of *every kind* of adorable presence of Christ in the Sacrament or elements." A person quite ignorant of the history of this Rubric might naturally have arrived at such a conclusion; but better is expected from "Presbyter," though the subject of this Rubric has been worn more than threadbare in your columns.

Can any one explain why it is called the Black Rubric? I pause for a reply.

ANXIOUS INQUIRER.

## ST. PAUL THE AUTHOR OF THE ACTS AND THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—If Mr. Heber Evans will kindly read my letter again, he will see that he has misunderstood it. It was your reviewer, not I, who asserted that his book is written with the tactical object of overthrowing the chief positions of Strauss and Zeller, on which I remarked that, *assuming* this to be the avowed intention of the book, more fatal tactics could not well be adopted.

Mr. Evans disavows this intention, and that, o

course, is final. As I said before, I have not read the book, and have only your reviewer's statements, *and his quotations from the book in support of them*, to guide me. I gladly withdraw the word "tactics," but I abide by the epithet "fatal." Mr. Evans thinks that if he has proved that St. Paul wrote the third Gospel and the Acts, "*the chief positions are at once overthrown for which the sceptics have contended*," who have made such persistent and fierce attacks upon the Gospels during the century." (I quote your reviewer's citation, the italics and capitals being the author's.) To which I reply that, on the contrary, by attempting to prove this paradox, Mr. Evans has placed a dangerous weapon in the sceptics' hands. They will reasonably say, "If the best chance of refuting us is to prove that St. Paul wrote the Third Gospel and the Acts, then the chance of our being refuted is small indeed."

To speak of "dogmatic assertion" and "*ipse dixit*" in connection with the Bishop of Durham is strangely out of place. The words which I quoted are a mere expression of personal conviction. "*No critical result* relating to the New Testament *seems to me more certain* than that the Acts of the Apostles was written by *a companion* of St. Paul." This opinion would have been weighty had it been given twenty years ago in Dr. Lightfoot's *Galatians*. Occurring as it does in his very latest work, a work which represents the labours of a lifetime, it is an opinion not easy to overestimate. And (quite independently of my own studies) when Mr. Evans claims to have "clear, logical proof" that the Acts was *not* written by a companion of St. Paul but by St. Paul himself, I feel sure that he is mistaken.

Let me state just one difficulty.

The long process, which ended in the composition of the Synoptic Gospels, is depicted in the Preface to the Third Gospel in its latest phase. The Evangelist has been moved to collect information from primary sources by the fact that *many* persons have already written narratives of the works of Christ, which narratives are in accordance with the traditions delivered by eye-witnesses.

St. Paul was put to death, possibly A.D. 64, and certainly not later than A.D. 69.

Is it credible that the traditions had been formed and delivered, the many narratives written, the third Evangelist's materials collected, the Gospel written, the materials for the Acts collected, and the Acts written, *before* A.D. 69?

I do not wish to argue the question; but I hope that Mr. Evans will believe that it is not prejudice, but conviction based upon study, which makes me absolutely sceptical alike of the truth and of the utility of his theory. It seems to be one of those theories which can be admitted as possible only at the cost of unsettling scores of well-established things. Some well-meaning people still contend that the passage about the Three Heavenly Witnesses (to be read by many of us next Sunday) is possibly genuine. The result of which is that, if that is possibly genuine, half the New Testament is possibly false.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Easter Week, 1886.

## FREE TRADE.

SIR,—The quotation from the "Wealth of Nations" is clear, but does not help us much. It simply states that we should act fairly, and this no one is prepared to deny. I do not know why your correspondent speaks of the "Protection" fallacy in connection with this correspondence. I am writing against what I consider is Free Trade—an imposition.

I do not think that "B" has even now shown clearly what is the cause of the general depression. He says that Free Trade gave us prosperity. We ask, Why then have we now adversity? He answers, (1) because prices are low? (2) because gold has changed in value. But this is no answer at all. The question still remains; If Free Trade is such a rectifier of all wrongs, why does it not rectify this?

Your correspondent may be clever at guessing, but, in this case, he is wrong. I was not at Chemnitz, but in a large town where the manufactures are various. I visited the factories, and they were all in full work. The goods were, in most cases, being prepared for England. I looked for signs of poverty, but found none. I was constantly arguing these points with a Radical, to whom I indicated these things. I asked him for proofs of his arguments in favour of Free Trade and the other articles of his creed, but received none. May I ask "B" (1) to point out the industries that are flourishing in this country, and (2) to give us proofs that trade is not good now in Germany? I demur to both assertions. Does he know that the Swiss hotel keepers say that they like best to see Germans now, for they have most money.

"B" is quite welcome to all the comfort he can take out of a printer's error, though to say this is hardly argument. It may serve to remind him that he need not occupy time and space with reference to so small a matter.

I am sorry that "B" requires that I should point out to him a fact which is patent to most ordinary observers—the handicapping of the farmer. I suppose we all are prepared to admit that he is a home producer? He is heavily and most unjustly overweighted. With him it is a constant question of taxes and rates. It has been estimated that his taxes amount—I think the estimate is far, very far, below the actual figure—to a sum equal to a tax of four shillings a quarter. With this tax then he goes into the market. The foreigner goes into the market toll free. Besides all this, there are the considerations of less productive land, higher wages, and greater rents. The handicapping of the English farmer is perfectly monstrous.

One wonders if "B" has ever been to market, he talks with such child-like simplicity. Pardon me, Mr. Editor, pardon me! In face of this language, I can hardly help myself—"If your correspondent supposes that if we should impose taxes on goods coming from abroad, any but the consumer would pay the tax . . . . he is in absolute error." The tax, in the farmer's case, enters into the cost of production. The tax in the foreigner's case does not. This is most extraordinary logic. If the consumer paid the tax, it would follow that the farmer's produce would be very dear, for the cost of production is out of all proportion with the price. But facts, facts, facts! These are hard things. The truth is "B" forgets another cause always in operation—that of supply and demand. Let "B" take six horses into the market and find but three purchasers, he will then learn that cost of production is not the most important factor in determining the price.

My letter is already long, and I fear to trespass; but that "B" may see that I did not speak without

my book, I would beg to remind him of the effects of the invention of the steam engine, the telegraph, the railways, the desire for speculation, &c., &c. These are the things that gave the impetus to trade, "in spite of . . . ."

The question of Free Trade resolves itself into that of the incidence of taxation. This, however, must for the present remain untouched for want of space.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, April 24th, 1886.

## Reviews and Notices.

"HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH," with Notes and Introduction by the Venerable T. T. Perowne, B.D., Archdeacon of Norwich, late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Pp. 159. University Press, 1886.

This volume of the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges appears in the handy form of these manuals, excellent in type, arrangement of the text and footnotes. With its predecessors it will doubtless prove useful to students of Holy Scripture for whom these volumes are intended. For the editor of Haggai and Zechariah, we entertain profound respect and a grateful personal recollection of his lectures at Corpus College some thirty years ago and more. Our criticism on the book before us, if adverse, is only so from a purely literary point of view, and in nowise affects our esteem.

We assume that one of the first duties of an editor of prophetical books, is to realize for himself the exact historical position of the sacred writers, and, by a vivid representation of their environment and objects, to transport his readers mentally to the times of their living actuality. Grammar, context, and references should all help to illustrate the writer's standpoint and contact with his own generation. Words and expressions should first be exhibited in their intelligible contexts, and the impulse to wrench them for ulterior purposes should be firmly resisted. The student has a right to demand of his guide, the editor, that he should primarily be helped to understand the prophet, as far as possible, as the men of his own day understood him. The introduction to the book should clear away past misconceptions and unhistoric statements; it should clearly grasp and embody the most recent discoveries which shed a light on those far off days. We regret that the Archdeacon's introduction fails in this respect. With much that is excellent he makes statements which are now obsolete and which the student of his book will have, one day, assuredly to unlearn.

For instance, relying upon Stanley's "Jewish Church," he describes Cyrus, the conqueror of Babylonia, as a Persian monotheist, a worshipper of Ormazd, and his restoration of the Jewish captives as a distinctly *religious* act. Now our Assyriologists have shown that these notions are in error. The Rev. A. H. Sayce proves, from the monuments, that Cyrus, the king of Anzan (Elam), was a worshipper of Bel and Nebo, the servant and worshipper of Merodach, who took credit for restoring the gods and repairing their sanctuaries. This is the distinctly *religious* act of Cyrus. As this sovereign was enabled to enter Babylon in peace, through the revolt of the subjects of king Nabonidas, it is probable, as Mr. Sayce suggests, that Cyrus rewarded the active part which the captive Jews took against their Babylonian masters, by permitting "the remnant" to return to their own land. Something of this kind seems hinted at in the monumental records, "As for the sons of Babylon...their ruins I repaired and I delivered their prisoners." In any case Ormazd does not appear in the monuments till seventeen years afterwards, when Darius Hystaspes, having taken Babylon by stratagem, after a two years' siege, and slain the usurper Gotames (not Smerdis as the editor has it) recorded his deeds and ascribed the victory to Ormazd: "By the grace of Ormazd I became king; Ormazd granted me the sceptre."

We conclude, therefore, that Cyrus was a polytheist, and that the reign of the monotheistic sovereigns of Persia began with the Achæmenian Darius, son of Hystaspes. If this view be correct, the editor not only reproduces what is now obsolete, but he misses the guidance of providence in turning the Jews by means of the captivity from a nominal to a real monotheism, firstly, by bringing them as captives under idolatrous conquerors, at Babylon, against whose religion, with the natural antagonism of the oppressed, they would rebel; secondly, in restoring them to their own land in a peaceful way, before Babylonia, the home of their captivity was involved in the dynastic war of Darius, with its inevitable losses; and lastly, by granting them two centuries of peaceful development under the rule of the all powerful monotheistic Persian potentates. How much or how little the religious ideas of the restored and peaceful Jews were moulded by the prevailing Zoroastrianism at Persepolis and Susa, may be a matter of debate; but it seems an historic proof of Divine guidance that the restoration and growth of the Jewish State took place under the circumstances alluded to. An Antiochus Epiphanes, on the Persian throne, would infallibly have crushed it to death.

Turning from the introduction to the appendix "On Satan," we find again the old statements repeated, without regard to the protests of the best Parsee scholars. The editor declines to believe that the Jews learned their true doctrine of God and Satan from the false doctrine of Persian dualism, with which they came in contact in the land of their captivity. We should, ourselves, doubt greatly whether they came in contact with it there at all, seeing that "the remnant" were already returned to Judea before the conquest of Darius, the first Zoroastrian monarch; but what we object to, is the insistance on Persian dualism. We are aware that colour for the expression may be derived from the books of the Parsees, but our ablest scholars reject the idea. Dr. M. Haug ("Essays on the Parsis," p. 303), asserts that this dualism is "opposed to, and entirely foreign to, Zarathrustra's theology." A later writer, Dr. William Geizer ("Civilization of the Eastern Iranians in Ancient Times") enters his protest against considering Zoroastrianism as a dualistic religion. Max Düncker ("History of Antiquity," vol. v. p. 159) shows that the Iranian Satan has no independent power of creation; his opposition appears in physical evil (the standpoint of the Book of Job), and in moral evil, idleness, lies, lust, and disbelief (the standpoint of St. Paul). "They," the Iranians, "were as far from setting up a dualism of equally balanced forces as any other religion." This inferiority of the Iranian Satan was noticed so long ago as Plutarch (*de Isid.* 46). Nowhere in scripture, canonical or apocrypha, is a

word breathed against this supposed Persian dualism. In the cuneiform inscriptions of king Darius, Aūramazdā, like Jehovah in the Old Testament, is God alone without adversary.

We argue against misrepresentation as injurious to younger students—knowledge which they will be glad one day to unlearn. We do not argue against an independent Hebrew conception of "the adversary." Only let us recognize that of revelation, properly so called, in the Bible concerning Satan there is none. Job, Zechariah, etc., assume in their readers a knowledge of his character and power; they do not define or reveal. Demonology, as a philosophy—revelation we cannot call it—appears first clearly in the apocryphal Book of Enoch, of the Parthian period; a book boldly quoted by Jude and more largely borrowed from in the Apocalypse. A slight perusal of Archbishop Laurence's translation will convince the unprejudiced of its parallelism to Zoroastrian ideas.

Turning from this gloomy subject to the Books of the Prophets themselves, we are glad to find that scholarship and common sense have prevailed over Pusey and Trench, in the rendering of Haggai ii. 7, and that "the desire of all nations" should be "the desirable things of all nations." We recommend cordially the editor's note on the passage and we may add a reference apparently overlooked, viz.: Joel iii. 5, where, referring to the properties of the old Temple lost in captivity, the prophet says, "Ye have taken away my silver and my gold, and have carried into your temples *my desirable things*" (margin). A reference to Ezra and Josephus will show the importance the Jews attributed to the Temple properties.

There is not much that calls for special notice in Haggai, whose brief book is all homogeneous and belongs manifestly to the early days of the return; not so Zechariah, its difficulties are great. The editor gives a fair statement, taken from Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," of the differences of opinion amongst biblical scholars respecting the authorship of the two main portions into which the book naturally falls. But he does not go far enough. He omits all notice of the latest criticism of the second portion (Zech. ix.-xiv.). Vatke, Stade, and the new librarian at Cambridge, W. Robertson Smith, pronounce in favour of a very late date, viz., the era of the *Seleucidæ*. One would suppose that the editor would have noticed this phase of the controversy, and given his readers some convincing reasons for or against the new view. We confess here to serious disappointment. He holds, we imagine, to unity of authorship in the time of the historic Zechariah, in the sixth century, B.C., and yet he contrives, here and there, in his notes to bewilder the student by references to the period of Alexander the Great (4th century), and even of Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors (2nd century). See notes on Zech. ix 2, 13 and xi. 8. This confusion is unfortunate, and mars the value of the book. We miss the firm grasp on the subject which can alone help to convey a distinct idea to our minds. We certainly protest against the words of the prophet bent this way or that, according to fancy, or made to convey meanings which it was utterly impossible for the men of his day to understand. Of course this fashion of interpreting has Christian antiquity on its side, but we think it high time to put it aside as childish. It shows the inherent power of Christianity that it survives wounds in the house of its friends, and that their precious balms have not long ago broken its head. We trust that in a second edition the blemishes we have pointed out in a friendly spirit will be carefully corrected.

THE Rev. Joshua Hughes-Games, D.C.L., has, it is stated, been appointed Archdeacon of the Isle of Man, in succession to the late Archdeacon Moore. The new Archdeacon (who was formerly known as the Rev. Joshua Jones) was ordained in 1854 to the curacy of St. Mary's, Dodleston, Cheshire, subsequently accepting the curacy of Holy Trinity Church, Hulme. He has since held in succession the vice-principalship of the York Training College, and the head mastership of the Liverpool Institute, relinquishing the latter position in 1865 on his preferment to the offices of Principal and Dean of the Chapter of King William's College, Isle of Man, which will now become vacant. Dr. Hughes-Games is also principal of the Sodor and Man Theological School, and examining chaplain to the Bishop of the diocese, which offices he will still retain.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Crawford, Rev. John Robert, Rector of Gayton Thorpe and Vicar of East Walton (annexed), Norfolk.
Eliot, Rev. P. F., Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bournemouth; Canon of Windsor.
Hughes-Games, Rev. Joshua, D.C.L., Principal of King William's College; Archdeacon of the Isle of Man, and Rector of Andreas.
Mitton, Rev. Arthur Tennant, M.A., Vicar of Stowmarket, Suffolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.
Moody, Rev. Henry, Senior Curate of Whittington; Vicar of Welsh Hampton, Salop.
Prior, Rev. Alfred Hall, M.A., Vicar of St. Alkmund's, Derby.
Ridley, Rev. C. W., Rector of St. Mary's, Wavertree, Liverpool.
Tanner, Rev. George Alfred, B.A., Vicar of Hognaston, Derbyshire.
Walker, Rev. Samuel Arthur, M.A., Rector of Spetisbury-cum-Chariton Marshall.
Watson, Rev. George William, M.A., Vicar of Shropham, Norfolk.
Whittaker, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Leesfield and Rural Dean of Oldham; Rector of Beckingham, Newark-on-Trent.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brereton, Rev. Shovell, at Briningham House, Norfolk, on the 21st ult., aged 91.
Craven, Rev. C. A. Assheton, M.A., late Senior Chaplain to Forces, Portsmouth, at Southsea, on the 21st ult., aged 59.
Evans, Rev. Thomas, of Nantyderry, for forty-four years Rector of Goytrey, Monmouthshire, and a Magistrate for the County, on the 16th ult.
Gibson, Rev. Henry, Rector of Fyfield, Ongar, on the 24th ult., aged 77.
Henderson, Rev, Henry Glass, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Shoreditch, on the 18th ult.
How, Rev. Augustus George, B.D., Rector of Doynton and formerly Vicar of Bromley, at the Rectory, on the 23rd ult., aged 72.
MacDougall, Rev. John, fourth son of the late Vice-Admiral Sir John MacDougall of MacDougall, K.C.B., at Dunollie, Argyllshire, on the 22nd ult.
Martyn, Rev. John, M.A., at 32, Heywood Street, Bury, Lancashire, on Easter Day, aged 43.
Tatham, Rev. John, formerly Incumbent of Rydal, Westmoreland, at Streatham, Surrey, on the 19th ult, aged 65.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE PHARISEE IN THE TEMPLE.

By the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D., Master of University College, Durham.

Sermon Preached in Durham Cathedral, on Ash Wednesday, 1886.

"I fast twice in the week; I give tithes of all that I get."—St. Luke xviii. 12 (Revised Version).

We are accustomed to pass severe condemnation upon the Pharisee in the parable. We think him hypocritical and insincere. But are we quite correct in our estimate of him? And are we quite the people to condemn him on these grounds?

What do we mean when we assert that this Pharisee was insincere? We surely do not mean that he was standing up in the Temple and making to the All-seeing God statements which he knew to be untrue; that all the while he was well aware that he was extortionate, and unjust, and an adulterer; and that, as a matter of fact, he neither kept the weekly fasts nor paid the usual tithes. Of any such insincerity on his part there is no evidence in the parable, nor is such a condition of things at all probable. No doubt there are people like Ananias and Sapphira, mean enough and false enough to try to gain credit from men for good deeds which they have never done; and such people (as Scripture reminds us) lie, not to men, but to God. If we did not think seriously about such things, every falsehood of whatever kind is really told in God's presence and to Him. But is it credible that anyone in the unheard workings of his own thought would place himself in the presence of Him who reads the heart and deliberately claim to have avoided crimes which he knew quite well that he had committed, and to have done good works which he knew that he had left entirely undone? We must admit that to force this interpretation upon the parable is to charge it with representing a state of mind that is barely possible. Doubtless we are to understand that the Pharisee believed himself to be free from the gross sins which he names, and that he really did keep the Monday and Thursday fasts week by week, and give to God the tenth part of his income.

But you will say, perhaps, that he did all this to gain the praise of men. It may well have been so; the motives of even the best of us in doing good and refraining from evil are very mixed, and the thought of the world's praise is only too seldom absent. But to obtain a good character from society cannot have been the Pharisee's only motive. Evidently he thinks of standing well in God's sight also; for when he goes up to the temple to worship, he lays his conduct solemnly before the Lord, and thanks Him for the general rectitude of it. These fasts and these alms represent a very real feeling of moral obligation. He believes that, although the law of Moses enjoined only one fast in the year, yet it is good for him to join those who decided to keep two every week. And he fully recognises the obligation imposed by the Law of giving a tithe of all his profits to the Giver of all good things. It is, therefore, by no means clear, that this Pharisee is to be condemned for conscious and barefaced insincerity.

And, what is perhaps a question of more moment to ourselves, are we quite the persons to condemn him? How many of us can solemnly place ourselves in God's sight and say that to the best of our belief we are neither unjust nor extortionate? How many of us, possessing (as from our childhood we have possessed) Christ's own interpretation of the seventh commandment, can look into our own hearts and say that we are guiltless? Do we in any way whatever—and our Church in the free spirit of the Gospel leaves the particular way to our own consciences—do we in any way whatever attempt to keep fast days? Do we give anything approaching to the tenth part of our income towards promoting the glory of God or the welfare of our fellow men? Think of the wholesale dishonesty with which the commerce and the trade of the world are tainted:—think of the oppression of class by class, of individuals by associations, of individuals by their fellows:—think of the cancer of both secret and shameless impurity that is eating out the very heart of every grade of society:—and then judge how many of us can stand in God's sight and solemnly profess that we are just, and merciful, and pure; that we are in no way responsible for the debased condition of public opinion in all these things. Or, to take the simpler and more definite tests put before us in the text, and specially appropriate to this season of Lent, how many of us, whether on fast days or not, make any serious attempt to practise self-denial; or take care year by year that a definite proportion of our income is invested, not in banks that may break, or in companies that may fail, but as treasure in Heaven, by being given through our brethren to Christ?

There is the self-denial of mere prudence, which constrains some men to deny themselves present luxuries and comforts, in order to secure at least the necessaries of life at some future day, when their strength fails through age, or sickness overtakes them.

There is the self-denial of moral rectitude, which constrains every honourable man to keep clear of every expense which he cannot thoroughly

afford, and to deny himself even some things that he can afford, lest in some dark day in the future he should become a burden to others, and cause money to be spent in supporting him, which would otherwise have been devoted to nobler objects.

There is a self-denial of moral fortitude, which invites us to undergo it, that we may brace our characters, which have lost tone through much indulgence in lawful things, and strengthen our wills, which have been weakened through indulgence in things unlawful.

And there is the self-denial of the Gospel, summing up and transcending all the rest, which bids us deny ourselves many luxuries and comforts that lie within our reach, in order that we may mortify the flesh with its affections and lusts, that we may have to give to him that needeth, and that we may become more like Christ.

Have none of these forms of self-denial any attractions for us? Can we not at least begin with the lowest motives, and endeavour through them to go on to something higher? He who has learned to give up present pleasure for the thoroughly legitimate though selfish reason of securing future comfort, may pass on to do the same for the nobler reason of saving others from a burden hereafter, or of having something to bestow on others now. And these nobler motives will be sanctified by the thought that self-sacrifice for the sake of others is the closest imitation of Christ, and that these others for whom the sacrifices are made, are representatives and members of Christ. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me."

Unless we recognise the obligation to practise habitual self-denial, and to devote to unselfish objects a liberal share of the money and time with which God has endowed us, we are in this respect far below the level of the much despised Pharisee. Are there any here who never keep any record of the amount which they give, year by year, in charity? This Lent will not be without profit to them if it induces them to begin at once to do so. There are thousands of Christians who would be amazed to be informed how paltry the annual amount of their benevolence is. They subscribe to a few charitable institutions. They are present when a collection is made in Church about a dozen times in the year; and each time they give a piece of silver. The total amount of subscriptions and offerings is at most a few pounds a year.

And meanwhile they are enjoying an income of hundreds, and perhaps thousands. Contrast that with the Pharisee giving a tenth part of everything that he gets.

I am stating no mere conjectures. Were this the place to do so, it would be easy to show from statistics that what has just been stated is no exaggeration. One fact, however, I will mention. The amount of income which paid income-tax in England and Wales in 1884 was over 530 millions. Where are the 53 millions that ought to have been given in charity? That would have been given in charity had Pharisees possessed this wealth. We may doubt whether a quarter of this sum was given in wealthy England

Where then was the Pharisee's great fault, if he was thus scrupulous in practising habitual self-denial and benevolence? He "exalted himself." He was proud of the good works which, through God's grace and God's bounty, he had been enabled to perform. Instead of humbling himself with the thought that he was still miserably short of what he ought to be, he plumed himself on the belief that he was better than most of his neighbours. He measured himself, not by the standard of God's holiness, to imitate which he was bound, but by his own estimate of the conduct of his fellow men. We are all of us prone to do this, and it is an error which is doubly fatal. First, we have no means of forming a just estimate of others. Their conduct may be far better than we believe it to be; and if not, we know little or nothing of the difficulties and temptations that make actions excusable in them, which would be inexcusable in us. Secondly, what has their standard of morality to do with ours? It may be our fault that their standard is so low. But their low standard is no guide for us. So long as we know that we are far below what we ought to be, far below what we feel that we might be as Christians, it will avail us nothing to be able to plead that we seem to be better than many of our neighbours.

There are just two attitudes in which the soul of the sinner can present itself before its God;—self-defence and self-reproach.* The Pharisee chose the one and the publican the other. Which do we habitually adopt? The man who defends his conduct before God aims far less at pleasing Him than at standing well with himself. Self-respect is his ideal. He loves to be conscious of his own integrity. He is free from gross sins, from deliberate, unmistakable acts of sin; and apart from acts of sin he has little consciousness of sinfulness. In his intellect he recognises the holiness of God; but in his heart he knows nothing of it, or of the immeasurable gulf which lies between God's holiness and his own life. He believes that God is everywhere and sees everything. But the sense of God's Presence neither cheers, nor awes, nor humbles him. He does not crave for it, as feeling his own utter emptiness. He does not shrink from it, as feeling his own pollution. Scrupulously exact in his dealings with others and in the observances of religion,—of the life with God, with its necessary humility, abasement, and sorrow for sin, he knows nothing. These are the attributes of him who, with the publican, chooses self-reproach. While the atmosphere of self-defence is pride, the atmosphere of self-

* See Archdeacon Manning's Sermons, Vol. IV. Sermon viii.

reproach is love. There are two things which the soul that loves God can never do. It can never be unconscious of its own guilt; and it can never wish to hide it. It can find no relief but in the shame of confession, which it knows is the road to purification. This be our work this Lent: to hide nothing, to palliate nothing; to welcome God's chastisements, nay, even to anticipate them. With the Pharisee let us keep our fasts and give tithes of all that we get, but in the spirit, not of pride, but of love; that we may have some security against our own deceitful hearts, when with the publican we cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

## CHRISTIAN PRIVILEGE AND OBLIGATION.

By the Rev. CHARLES EDWARD TISDALL, D.D., Chancellor of Christ Church Cathedral, and Incumbent of St. Dolough's, Diocese of Dublin.

Sermon Preached on Sunday, March 21st, 1886, in the Parish Church of St. Matthew, Dublin, on Behalf of "The Spiritual Aid Society."

"Therefore let no man glory in men, for all things are yours."—1 Cor. iii.; part of 21.

AMONG the evils in the Church at Corinth, which St. Paul designed to counteract, when addressing this letter to its members, was that of religious partizanship. Unseemly contentions had arisen to disturb the peace and obstruct the spiritual progress of that community. Deploring the existence of that evil, the Apostle took occasion to record a strong protest against the undue admiration manifested by each party for its favourite instructor. In order that the converts might be led to form a correct estimate of the Gospel-ministry, and of their own relation to it, he taught them that the qualifications of those instructors were so many gifts bestowed for the edifying of the Church. "Let no man glory in men, for all things are yours"—"*all* things, not only the teachers under whom you have elected to place yourselves, but "the world, life, death, things present, things to come, all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

First in order, among the spiritual privileges to which reference is made, is the Christian ministry. In an earlier part of the epistle searching questions had been put by the Apostle to those who were chargeable with the "contentions" of which he had been informed by members of the household of Chloe. "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptised in the name of Paul?" Those questions were eminently calculated to rebuke them for attaching an undue importance to the human element in the sphere of religious privilege. Now, earnest disciples of Him who was crucified for them and in whose name they have been baptised, form the true, because the scriptural, estimate of that element. Neither do they, on the one hand, unduly admire the "earthen vessel" if the teacher be richly endowed in mental faculties, nor, upon the other, do they think meanly of it if he be one of humble mental capacity. It is for the "*treasure*" they look, and, setting themselves in the attitude of hearers sincerely desirous of profiting unto salvation, they institute no invidious, no uncharitable comparisons between the men who "watch for souls as they that must give account." Whatever may be their preferences, they never allow them to interfere with the prayerfully formed resolution to derive good from all, to regard preaching as a divinely instituted ordinance by which "the powers of the world to come" are brought into operation for their spiritual well-being. They are uniformly ready to give the Gospel-message that hearty and grateful reception to which it is entitled by reason of its momentous importance, whether it be delivered with the fascinations of elegance of diction and of elocutionary power, or with the homeliness of a style wholly uncultured, and which could not for an instant abide the scrutiny of criticism. "All things" in the several efforts made to "win souls" are theirs, and in them all they take deep permanent interest. They rejoice to know that in the ministry of Christ's Church there are skilled reasoners to defend the outworks of Christianity, to repel invaders who with unhallowed daring seek to undermine the "faith once for all delivered to the saints," and they can equally rejoice that there are zealous agents, in comparatively obscure positions, who are successful in gaining entrance for the verities of that faith among the unlettered poor. In the "diversities of gifts" bestowed upon human agents, they can discern consummate wisdom, and, as they survey the varied instrumentality employed in the field of spiritual husbandry, they feel deep, personal interest in it all, because conscious that preparation is being made for the coming of the day when their beloved Redeemer "shall be glorified in His saints and admired in all them that believe."

"The world," the Apostle continues, "is yours." This transitory scene, the world of which he writes in the same epistle that "the fashion of it passeth away," is the school in which they who "use as not abusing it" are trained for a blissful immortality. Upon the irreligious, living as they do in the spirit of an all absorbing secularity, it has the pernicious effect of keeping them in estrangement from God, but, from resistance of its allurements, they who are really under the influence of religion grow strong in the life which is lived by faith. They know that it *is* "possible" (I quote the title of a valuable essay from the pen of one who was, in his day, a prominent leader* among the Congregationalists in

* The Rev. Thomas Binney, author of "The Practical Power of Faith," and of the essay above referred to.

England), "to make the most of both worlds." Being "alive unto God through Jesus Christ" they have personal experience of the truth of the apostolic statement, "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life which now is as well as of that which is to come." "The world" is the Christian's with its practical teachings, its chequered experiences, with all the salutary lessons which the events occurring in it are designed to convey to those who see it in the light shed upon it by revelation. Many things, doubtless, "happen alike" to "the children of light" and "the children of this world," to those who obey and those who refuse to obey the Gospel; but *all things* without limitation, *all things*, whether in seasons of prosperity or in those of adversity, "work together for good to them that love God." Secular occupation, too, while it so ensnares the minds of those who engage in it, in an essentially worldly spirit, as to render them unmindful of their eternal interests, is service to the heavenly Master when undertaken in the spirit of godliness. Of such occupations, carried forward upon Christian principles, it has been finely said that "it may be even made a means of religious advancement. Marble or coarse clay, it matters not much with which the true artist works, the touch of genius transforms the coarser material into beauty, and lends to the finer a value which it never had before." . . .
"Principle elevates whatever it touches. Facts lose all their littleness to the mind that brings principle to bear upon them. The chemists' or geologists' soiled hands are no sign of base work. The coarsest operations of the laboratory cease to be merely mechanical when intellectual thought governs the mind and guides the hands. And religious principle is the noblest of all. Live for Christ in common things, and all your work will become *priestly* work. As in the temple of old it was holy work to hew wood or mix oil because it was done for the altar sacrifice or the sacred lamps, so all coarse and common work will receive a consecration when done for God's glory by one who is a true priest to his temple."

"Life" is the sincere believer's in a sense in which none but those who are such can claim it as theirs. In that physical organism, "fearfully and wonderfully made," and in that hidden mechanism of the vital functions at work within the outward structure of the mortal frame, both the righteous and the unrighteous "live, move, and have their being" in the great First Cause of all existence. For both, the duration of life upon this earthly scene is alike uncertain, and none can know whether death will come with the rapidity of the lightning's flash, or menace often and delay long. Yet, while life in this world continues, they who take the scriptural view of it may be truly said to *live* in a sense widely different from that in which the short-sighted, infatuated votaries of the world live. They who have been "renewed in the spirit of their minds" live in the noblest sense, because they seek to fulfil the lofty purposes of their being, because they avail themselves of the opportunities given them of living, by the aid of God's grace, the noblest of all lives, that modeled after the life of Him who came, "leaving an example that we should walk in His steps."

But when referring to the subject of the Christian's possessions, the Apostle did not end with the mention of "life." He led his readers in thought to a region filled with objects from the sight of which humanity naturally recoils, and told them that "death" is theirs. For those who love and obey Him has Jesus Christ so revolutionised their relation to death, that the enemy is constrained to perform the office of a friend. Even before that enemy assails the Christian himself, the blows dealt him by death, when kindred are gathered to the grave, are graciously rendered effectual in loosing his yet too tenacious hold upon the perishable things of this present world, and in drawing him into closer communion with God. In that sense death renders the Christian service, even when there goes forward the rending of the closest, the most endearing of earthly ties—even when he is bowed down with agonizing grief, stunned by the heartrending bereavements which desolate his home. Death is his also when the inevitable summons is issued for his *own* departure from this mortal life. It is his as the agency commissioned to remove him from a state of conflict to one of rest, to consign his soul to the guardianship of One who, "by the mighty working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself," shall eventually enshrine it in a body raised after the fashion of His own glorified humanity. By the change caused by death, those who "sleep in Him" are "delivered from the burden of the flesh"—freed for ever from all physical infirmities, and, resting from their labours, shall in due season be partakers of that resurrection in which the "corruptible shall put on incorruption," and the "mortal immortality;" when there "shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory."

The thought of those inestimably valuable privileges, of some of which you have been to-day reminded, should cause "great searchings of heart" that precaution may be taken to guard against self-deception as to your state in the sight of Him for the sake of whose merits those privileges have been vouchsafed you. That responsibility and obligation are inseparably united requires no proof. "To whom much is given of them shall much be required." Of devotion to the Redeemer it has been well said* that it is "the exercise of thought and affection steadily directed upon His adorable Person, and also the exercise of the will, and is eminently practical." When the will is exercised conform-

* In "Some Elements of Religion," by Canon Liddon.

ably with His, then are invariably produced those "fruits of righteousness by which His doctrine is adorned." In His Name appeal is now to be made on behalf of "The Spiritual Aid Society." By grants of various amounts, it enables the select vestries of many parishes throughout the country, to offer more than is possible, without such help, to the clergy employed in assisting incumbents in their several districts of labour. The sum of twenty-one pounds is annually given to the parish of St. Matthew, and it is, therefore, but reasonable to expect that the local claim which has been thus created, will be generously recognised by those who, blessed with means, statedly attend the ministrations in this church. If it be a Christian's duty to contribute to the maintenance of societies the object of which is to send the light of "the glorious gospel of the blessed God" to remote places of the earth, that, through the instrumentality of foreign missions, His "way" may be made "known" among the heathen, it is assuredly also imperative upon those enlightened by its beams, to do their utmost to secure the preservation and diffusion of the light at home. It is one of the laws of the kingdom of grace, that self-denial for the advantage of our brethren in Christ brings with it inestimable spiritual blessings to ourselves. God "makes His grace to abound" towards those who are "careful to maintain good works, that they be not unfruitful." Prosperity in the life of faith is inseparable from Christian generosity. "The liberal soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth shall be watered also himself." As the collectors pass round to receive your contributions, think how goodly is that "heritage" of Church privilege, to which you have succeeded, as baptismally grafted into the mystical body of Him, by whom those privileges were purchased for you, with his most precious blood. Remember that self-renouncement is the temper of which the Redeemer's death is the highest expression. "He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves but unto Him who died for them, and rose again." Reflect, too, upon the certainty of the arrival of that day when it shall be rendered unto every man "according to his works." May it then appear that you so assiduously utilized the aids granted you in "working out your salvation" as to be "accounted worthy" to enter in through the "gates of the city" of imperishable foundations, where ordinances of divine grace shall be no longer requisite, for the fruition of the glorious "Godhead" shall have been attained. "I saw," wrote the beloved disciple, when describing one of the visions shown him of celestial glory, "no temple therein, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun neither of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 8, 1886.

## HEALTH OF THE SOUL DEPENDENT ON THE BODY.

A SINGULARLY practical and useful essay on "Body and Soul: being a practical view of the relations of Physical and Spiritual Life," by the Rev. Mercer Davies, M.A., formerly Chaplain of Westminster Hospital, published by Elliot Stock, last year, in the form of a sixpenny pamphlet, has just fallen under our notice. It is on a subject, the physical basis of morality, which is entirely ignored by the vast majority of the clergy and other teachers of morality. These successors and self-styled followers of Moses and Christ for the most part ignore the fact that both Moses and Christ were sanitary reformers before they were moral teachers. Moses gave us, direct from God, the most perfect code of sanitary laws that ever was framed. Our Saviour submitted to and adopted those laws, and Himself went about curing all manner of diseases in order to save and deliver the people from the effects of their own and their forefathers' sins. His primary charge to His disciples was: "Heal the sick; cleanse the lepers." Yet, strange to say, the great bulk of His professed ministers of the present day have, *as a matter of religion*, backed up Mr. Stansfield, our Minister of Health, and enabled him to repeal an Act of Parliament which has prevented more hereditary disease, healed more sick, cleansed more lepers, and saved more people from the effects of their own and their parents' sins than all other sanitary Acts of Parliament put together. If we are right in our reading of the Bible on this point, and in our position that the *corpus sanum* is a necessary precedent and postulate for the *mens sana*, the actual teaching of the great majority of our religious teachers is as vain and unprofitable as the delusive and misleading promises of our shrieking Prime Minister, who offers to give peace and prosperity to Irishmen without the necessary and indispensable preliminaries of order and government. It is a pamphlet well worth reading, for Mr. Davies knows precisely the main principle which he undertakes to enforce, and is endowed with the power of very clear exposition.

We greatly question the accuracy of the scientific details by which he illustrates and proves his thesis, and believe that there are but few, if any, physiologists of the present day who would not do the same. For example, he writes that "human physical life is evidently a force or entity which is generated or developed in the brain of man." Had he written "in the blood of man," he would have been more in accord with modern physiological investigations, and absolutely in agreement with Scripture, which asserts that "the life is in the blood." This theory seems to have been started in order that the "vital current," as he calls Life, may be identified with nerve-force, which with more reason is stated to be "very similar or analogous to the electric current." Now, doubtless, the brain, which is the instrument of sensation, motion, and thought, is the seat of nerve-force, but it does not follow that nerve-force is not generated by the brain from the blood. Recent investigations into the marvellous powers of the corpuscular and other elements of the blood, justify our suggestion that the author of this fascinating essay should place "the first links of the chain between the material and spiritual worlds" farther back, in the functions of the blood, instead of in its product the brain, and make the due evolution of life, physical, intellectual, and spiritual, depend on the healthy performance of the functions of this wonderful organ, which Holy Writ truly says is the life.

"I do not say" (the author writes, pages 8, 9) "that the soul is absolutely produced or formed from the body itself, but only that it is developed by the action of bodily functions . . . . that its power, its activity, its energy, are developed by these important functions of the organic brain."

He therefore proceeds to trace some indications of this connection between the physical and the moral work of the brain. When the brain is healthy, both physically and morally, like all the other great organs, the heart, stomach, liver, etc., its action is not sensibly felt in the body; but when any mischief is going on, then the brain, like any other organ, shows signs of this fact by uneasy sensations; and this in regard to *moral* disturbance as well as *physical*. For instance, when a man has committed any serious crime, he feels what are commonly called the "stings of conscience," a sensation more or less painful, which, as the author says, "we can have no hesitation in localising, as being really seated in the brain"; and which he therefore infers to be evidence of some disturbance in the regular functions of this organ. And this disturbance, he argues, if not removed; this disease of the conscience, if not remedied; must ultimately wear out the life and powers of the brain, and thereby, in fact, destroy the true life and soul of the man.

This attempt to trace the dangers of living against the conscience, in the physical disturbance and disorganisation of the brain, is perhaps the most original and ingenious part of this little essay. It seems at least worthy of attention, as suggestive of a new field of inquiry. To our mind the author satisfactorily demonstrates that there is some chain of connection between the material and spiritual worlds—between body and soul. If the learned and conscientious author would demonstrate the truth of this most important doctrine of the inter-dependence of bodily and spiritual health from Holy Scripture, as he easily can, we believe that he would vastly promote religion and morality.

The whole paper, though not deeply scientific, and not beyond the comprehension of ordinary people, is yet written chiefly upon a scientific or physiological basis; and is, therefore, independent of any particular theological tenets. At the same time, the author points out that his conclusions agree with some of the most important moral lessons of Christianity. They also serve to illustrate a principle which is frequently insisted on in the PULPIT, namely, the intimate connection which subsists between a healthy condition of the body and of the mind, between "Health and Immortality."

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### FREE TRADE.

SIR,—I shall not be able to make this letter so short as I should wish, for I have three writers against me to reply to. You, Sir, suggest that a tax of 1s. per ton should be imposed on coal exported from England. We do not export 150 millions of tons a year, we raise that quantity. I do not know how much we export, but, deducting what is burned in our own steamboats, which I suppose you don't propose to tax, I shall be surprised to learn that it is much more than one-tenth of what you have heard. That tax would be paid by ourselves, not by the purchasers. It would be a bounty on mining for coal in other countries. An income and property tax is far fairer. If it costs 2d. in the pound to collect our present income-tax, that is four millions, which I do not believe it does cost; probably a tenth part of it or thereabouts. Belgium does not now "enjoy" a protective system of finance; for more than forty years the Belgian tariffs have been the freest in Europe, and are so now. The data "so carefully put together by Lord Penzance," consisting of a few figures supplied by Mr. Mulhall, prove—what? Let me see. The commerce of the world has multiplied eight-fold in fifty years; that is, the external commerce of the various countries enumerated. That of England has increased seven-fold; that of the "protecting" countries, some in a greater ratio, some less. But the freest countries, our own Colonies, the Low Countries, and Austria, have increased their external trade by the largest multiples, fourteen, nine, and thirteen respectively, and the most "protecting," the United States and Spain, by six and a-half and three and a-half respectively. Again, take the whole amounts,

not by percentages, and find the total amount of the added external commerce of them all fifty years ago, and the like total amount now, and then find what percentage of the total increase belongs to England; and England would show, not seven per cent., but far more, I dare say four times seven. Figures of themselves prove nothing, and nothing is more easy than to apparently establish a contention by the use of averages when you ought to use totals, and by the use of totals when you ought to use averages.

The extract from Lizt given by Mr. Gurney is not to the point of what I said my view of that economist is, viz., that he attends more to the phenomena of distribution than of production. It is quite true that political economy cannot set aside moral, political, and equitable considerations. It presumes them, but they form no part of it. It presumes that when A sells goods to B, B will pay for them; but it does not treat of the question, which is one for those learned in law, how B is to be made to pay if he wants to defraud. Mr. Gurney appears to regard economics as an art or science with production for its end. If so, it is not a science at all; no science that I know of has any end but itself. Science is an investigation into the laws, of matter, of the human mind, and the like. From the knowledge of the science practical maxims of art may be, and are, derived; but those maxims, and the methods used in applying them, are not science.

The reason why trade is depressed at this time, viz., low prices, caused by a higher value of gold, appears insufficient to Mr. Sandlands; but there is no person practically acquainted with trade to whom it does not appear sufficient. "The question," he says, "still remains, If Free Trade is such a rectifier of all wrongs, why does it not rectify this?" Who says that Free Trade is a rectifier of all wrongs? I never said so. I said that a condition of freedom, both of production and exchange, is that under which the greatest increase of wealth results. It is a noticeable thing, that the commencement of the present period of depression was synchronous with the cessation of our Free Trade reforms. The last abolition of a tax on foreign products was of that on sugar, in 1874; and the price of things in general began to decline, certainly as early as 1876. If we should now return to our old system, that of Sir Robert Peel, and of Mr. Gladstone till he began heroic legislation of another kind, and abolish our ridiculous taxes on tea and tobacco, and on Spanish wine, the increase of our foreign trade, and accordingly of our prosperity, would be great and immediate.

I think it very likely that Mr. Sandlands received no proofs of the soundness of the Free Trade principle from his Radical; he will not receive them even from me, who am a Tory. The industries in this country that are now prosperous are numerous; two under my immediate notice occur to me—shirt and collar making, and extensive branches of machine-making. My knowledge of the state of trade in Germany is derived from trade correspondence. Your correspondent need not be at the trouble to question any statement of matter of fact that I make. I do not know what printer's error there was in one of his letters.

He estimates the taxes and rates on agricultural land in England at equal to four shillings a quarter (wheat, I suppose). At five quarters an acre—a good, not extravagant, crop,—this is £1 per acre; at four quarters—a poor crop—it is sixteen shillings an acre. If this includes income-tax, that is no handicapping of the grower, for he has to pay it, no matter how his income may be earned. If it is county rate, it is money paid for the use of roads and police, and is no handicapping, as he would find if he must yoke four horses to his waggon instead of two, when he takes his wheat to market, having no paved road to travel on; and when thieves would break through and steal more value than the police cost. Poor rates, I admit, are a burthen, and an indirect burthen to society, far heavier than the financial burthen to the farmer, owing to the demoralisation that they produce. But, all put together, I cannot accept the estimate of a pound an acre. I never believe anything on "it has been estimated." "The foreigner goes into the market toll free." I suppose he pays taxes in his own country. Certainly he pays none here, and cannot be made to pay any. Last month your correspondent complained of me as obscure; now I talk with child-like simplicity. I am glad that I am at least perceived to be trying to be understood. Mr. Sandlands ought to know that it is a thing known in theory by all economists, and in practice by all business men, that the consumer of an article pays any tax that may be put on that article. His comments on what I said go to show that he does not understand the proposition; which, however, is very simple, and is an almost fundamental one in economic investigation. The subject of the action of demand and of supply is not new to me; I could say much on it, were it in any way pertinent to the matter of the proposition.

Mr. Sandlands is quite correct that the invention of the steam-engine, railways, etc., gave great development to trade; but he need not "remind" me of it, as I spoke of their action in my last letter, as the new channels at that time (1846-1850, when the railway system began to be vast) opened.

B.

May 1st, 1886.

[We did not intend that the excise duty on coal should be restricted to the quantity we exported, although we assumed that the foreign would pay the duty as well as the home consumer. Would it not be patriotic to give a bounty on mining for coal in other countries?—ED.]

## ST. PAUL THE AUTHOR OF THE ACTS AND THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—Suffer me to say, in reply to Dr. Plummer that I disavow nothing. Dr. Plummer originally said, "More fatal tactics could not well be adopted." He now withdraws the word "tactics," but "abides by the epithet 'fatal.'" What is fatal to what? Truth, obviously, cannot be fatal to anything but error, and the more fatal it proves to error, surely the better—even if that error take the form of pre-conceived opinions held in defiance of evidence which is ignored. Dr. Plummer adds, "Mr. Evans has placed a dangerous weapon in the sceptic's hands." How so? If the assertion of St. Paul's authorship of the Acts be untrue, disprove it; if it be true, how, once more, can this truth be so desperately deadly and dangerous? Surely we had better know the truth and face the truth. The "rash hypothesis" which strikes Dr. Plummer as a "paradox" did not seem a "paradox" to the Christian Fathers, or to Bengel and many other modern commentators. The usual account of

the Third Gospel and the Acts is that Luke wrote the books more or less under the influence of St. Paul. It is Strauss and others who have denied the historical character of the Gospels, and affirmed them to be untrustworthy inventions of the second century—no testimony of eye-witnesses. I am not anxious to prove that every word in the history is due to St. Paul. My contention has reference to the date and to the historical value of the writings. It is quite impossible to maintain the absurd statement that the *Gentile* Luke could *of himself* have produced such a thoroughly *Jewish* history as the Acts and Third Gospel. But, as I have said, Luke may have been the amanuensis of St. Paul. And obviously, if these writings were executed in St. Paul's lifetime, under St. Paul's superintendence, here is just the answer we want for the aggressive sceptics of Germany. The four great (undisputed) Epistles of St. Paul no doubt give us much, but not everything. As Dr. Wace says: "The Gospels *alone* afford us full information respecting our Lord's character and work, and they must ever be regarded as the most precious and important of testimonies to His claims. It is this, indeed, which has led the sceptics and unbelievers of this century to direct such persistent and fierce attacks upon the Gospels." Not to mention other matters, Dr. Plummer would, I fear, look in vain in the Epistles for the great parables of the Prodigal Son, and of the Good Samaritan.

The Bishop of Durham's remark cannot be quoted as a decisive opinion against the authorship of St. Paul. The emphasis may be on "St. Paul," not on "companion." I, too, think it probable that "the Acts were written by a companion of St. Paul"—St. Paul himself being close at hand, dictating, or, at least, planning and revising. The Bishop's statement may not improbably have reference to the allegations of the Tübingen school. I protest, however, against "the tactics" of attempting to crush off-hand, under the weight of a great name, a conclusion supported by numberless facts. These facts must be carefully examined before judgment can be pronounced, and, I may add, there are some things which a child can perceive just as readily as a philosopher, as, for instance, that a ball is round, while learning is not necessary for—nor indeed always conducive to—the attainment of truth.

When Dr. Plummer says: "I have not read the book—I do not intend to argue—I feel sure that Mr. Evans is mistaken," what is all this but saying that Dr. Plummer has decided the case without going through the needless and tedious formality of hearing the evidence? In fact, he is administering to me (fortunately in a mild form) Jedburgh justice. I am almost tempted to remind Dr. Plummer of the Berræans, who seemed to the author of the Acts "more noble" than others, because "they searched daily, with all readiness of mind, whether those things were so."

The "tactics" of deciding that a certain conclusion could not be allowed to be true, because this could "only be at the cost of unsettling scores of well-established things," were tried in the seventeenth century, in the case of Galileo, and with but poor success. Certain it is that "the world has moved" since then, and I cannot but think that Dr. Plummer would be well-advised to regard matters rather from a nineteenth century than from a seventeenth century stand-point.

My thesis cannot be overthrown by the opinion of any individual, however learned or distinguished—still less can it be negatived without an examination of the numerous philological facts on which it rests. These *philological facts* conclusively prove a *psychological identity* between the author of St. Paul's Epistles and the author of the Acts; and no preconceived ideas, no repugnance to results, can prevail against so palpable a proof obtained by means of the inductive method. Until these facts—these particularly stubborn facts—are in some way satisfactorily disposed of, the assertion that St. Paul was the author of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Third Gospel must necessarily continue, in a certain sense, "to hold the field."

Thanking you for your courtesy in finding space for my letters in your interesting columns.

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 4th, 1886.

P.S.—Does not my critic, your learned reviewer, perceive that by saying "such 'fatal tactics' must be firmly withstood," he has *ipso facto* abdicated the serene, impartial seat of judgment, and descended into a lower sphere—the arena of the advocate and the partisan? And has he not by so doing greatly diminished the value of his critical conclusions?

One is almost inclined to ask if all sensible men, both in Church and State, have not been too much the victims of "tactics," and groaned too long under the tyranny of "party"?

## THE LARGER HOPE.

SIR,—Your correspondent "J. B." understands me to suppose that it is a condition necessary to a state of freedom to be free. It would be but carping if I objected to the words in which he imputes to me this. But I do not think that the endless uncertainty that would result therefrom, is of such a degree that we in this life, or in the other life, need or ought to trouble ourselves about it.

There is some vagueness as to the meaning of "free." The Calvinists deny the freedom of the will. I apprehend that most Calvinists do not understand by this what, let us say, Leibnitz meant by it. They would say that the will is enslaved by evil desires, etc., and that the truth makes men free; that to speak of the freedom of an enslaved will is nonsense. This is not erroneous; and to maintain the freedom of the will, as it is now understood, is not erroneous either.

I cannot accept your correspondent's invitation to define what I understand by eternal punishment. The Bible is very reticent about it. I believe that there is such a thing; no more, except that it is in more than one place indicated as banishment from the Divine presence. I doubt not that it is wisdom in the Almighty to withhold from us knowledge of the particulars of that life where spirit will be, I suppose, in a relation to matter and mind analogous to that which they have in this existence towards spirit.

I am conscious of the necessity of the corollary that Mr. Murphy draws from my proposition; but not of the necessity of all that he appears to draw from the corollary. "The hope of the world to come includes our perfect purification from sin." Yes; but not in absolute consequence our absolution from the possibility of sin. "Perfect" also, may be misunderstood. That perfection may not be more than a high,

and perhaps constantly advancing, degree of perfection.

I do not dogmatise. There are obscure allusions to "the angels that sinned," which certainly point to a condition of the world of spirit, such as I am disposed to think the future will be.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

May 1st, 1886.

P.S. The Black Rubric is so called because in the oldest Prayer-books it was printed with black ink, all others with red ink.

## THE BLACK RUBRIC ONCE MORE!

SIR,—I am sorry to have to trouble you and your readers again in reference to the Romish teaching of the *Church Times*. But, as often as falsehood is stated, so often is it our duty to contend earnestly for "the faith once delivered to the saints."

2. In this week's number, in answer to queries, I read, "If our Lord's Body be not present in the Eucharist, there is no Real Presence in the accepted Christian sense at all." Of course, if our Lord's Body be not present, it is not present. The question is how it is present, whether as the sun is present in the sky, or as it is in my garden or room? Our best divines say, as it is present in my garden or room. Jeremy Taylor shows the absurdity of a local presence extending through all space down to us. "In the accepted Christian sense," is a begging of the question. Cosin's, Jackson's, Bull's sense is quite Christian enough for me.

3. But now comes a downright falsehood. "The Black Rubric merely denies that the presence is according to the ordinary law of physical bodies," Where has the Black Rubric any such distinction? Not a word of it! Following St. Augustine, it says that our Lord's Natural Body, that is His Body as it now exists, connot be in two places at once. As it is in Heaven ,it cannot be locally on our Altars. It denies a Corporal Presence, that is any presence except that of effects, as of the sun in my room or garden. A spiritual presence of any other kind than one of effects, is nonsense. A spiritual body in that sense, is as absurd as a corporal spirit. What St. Paul means by a spiritual body may be explained by what he calls afterwards "a quickening spirit." One cannot turn a body into a spirit unless we make it cease to be a body at all; and then Christ's Body is not risen; and we are yet in our sins. At any rate, your contemporary states Romish doctrine, which our Article and Black Rubric pretend, at least, to denounce, and that by name, as Transubstantiation, and not by any new-fangled designation.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S. Since writing the above I have seen "Anxious Enquirer's" letter in your last. The reason why "corporal presence" was substituted for "real and essential" is because what it is meant to deny is a local presence, whilst maintaining one of efficacy, like that of the sun, as asserted by Bertram, Cranmer, Ridley, and ever since by Cosin (one of the Savoy bishops) Bull, Jackson, J. Taylor, Sutton, &c.

2. Leaving aside "adorable," the Black Rubric denies a local presence as impossible. To adore a local presence, then, is impossible. Perhaps the rubric is called black because printed in black letters. I only suggest this. Some will say it was called black because held so objectionable by secret Tridentines in our Church. The subject may be worn threadbare, but so is not the Black Rubric, whatever hard rubs it has received.

---

SIR,—I am no Jupiter, and doubtless I often nod in spite of all my endeavours to keep my head steady. But in the present instance, it appears to me, that what the drowsy fit has attacked is the logic of your correspondent "Anxious Enquirer." The matter stands thus. King Edward's Rubric, drawn up to conciliate the more extreme of the reformed party, disclaimed any adoration to be intended by the posture of kneeling, "either unto the sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being, of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood," and declared the posture to be merely one of humility and gratitude. When this Rubric, after being omitted for more than a century, was restored for the sake of the Puritans by the Caroline Divines, for the phrase "real and essential presence" they substituted "corporal presence." Therefore, argues "Anxious Enquirer," the present Rubric permits *adoration* of a "real and essential presence" in the sacrament, although the original rubric forbad it! Was there ever a more flagrant *non-sequitur?* If he had written that the change in the rubric tacitly admitted *belief* in a "real and essential" presence in the sacrament, so long as it is not a "corporal presence," he would have been right enough. But *adoration* is a very different thing from *belief*. The very purpose of the rubric was to ease the minds of the Puritans, who scrupled to kneel because of the semblance of a worship paid to a presence on the altar. What could have been more stultifying, than purposely to draw up the protestation in such terms as to imply that the kneeling might lawfully be construed to mean adoration of a real and essential, though not corporal, presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament on the altar? The Rubric, therefore, must be understood to disclaim the purpose of adoration altogether, and not only in the case of a supposed corporal presence, and thus to agree with the 28th Article which says that "The sacrament of the Lord's supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

There are two very dissimilar ways of approaching the Anglican formularies. One brings to them an honest and unprejudiced desire to ascertain their original and historical meaning; the other deals with them in a polemical spirit, which endeavours to find in them, or force upon them, a meaning which it is wished that they should have. The famous Tract XC. was an instance of the latter method, which unhappily is not quite obsolete. If "Anxious Enquirer" will approach the Black Rubric in the former, I think he will be convinced that the relaxation tacitly implied in the change of phraseology refers to the definition of the sacramental presence only, and does not touch the protest against the kneeling posture of reception being misconstrued as an act of adoration. Probably, he was betrayed into his logical fallacy by unconsciously taking it for granted that if the body and blood of Christ are, *in any sense*, present in the sacrament, they must be present in a form to which worship is due. But that is precisely what the Anglican formularies do not admit. They virtually distinguish between a sacramental presence, and a presence which may be adored. The sacramental presence in which

they encourage us to believe is a spiritual and heavenly one, and may be called *real*, (although they do not use that word) because, as the Homily says, "In the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent." To safeguard this presence from being excluded by the denial of "any real and essential presence," the Caroline divines altered these words into "any corporal presence." But the protest against the kneeling posture being "misconstrued and depraved" into an act of adoration, and the assertion of its true intention as "a humble and grateful acknowledgment, &c.," remain unaltered, and exclude the adoration of the sacramental presence of Christ's body and blood, however defined.

PRESBYTER.

## Reviews and Notices.

"THE MONTHLY INTERPRETER." May, 1886. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

PROFESSOR BRUCE'S articles on "The Kingdom of God" still maintain their high level of excellence. This month's article is on the "Positive Aspect of the Righteousness of the Kingdom," and there is a manliness and a freedom from sentimentality about all Dr. Bruce says which is most refreshing. "It behoves the Christian disciple," says Dr. Bruce, "to imitate the Master in his sympathies with the objects of pity, the poor, the sorrowful, the sinful; in his antipathies against the religious vices of Pharisaism, in his lowliness, and in his heroic devotion to duty at whatever cost of self-sacrifice."

In his paper on the Second Book of Samuel, is Dr. Payne Smith right in saying: "At the end of chapter viii. we read that David's sons were his *cohanaim*, his confidential ministers." Were they not priests, even in defiance of the law? If Solomon offered sacrifice in spite of the law, why should not David's sons have been priests in spite of it? It is true that the parallel passage in Chronicles speaks of them, not as כֹּהֲנִים but as רִאשֹׁנִים, but there is nothing surprising in that, when the tendency of the authors of the books of Chronicles is remembered.

Dr. King's Notes on the Revised Version of the Psalter are interesting, and his suggestions sometimes very good, especially on the 29th Psalm, but they are too long to quote. We are not *quite sure* that we agree, but that is nothing to the purpose; we have noted them for future reference and further examination.

Professor Sayce's fifth paper on "The Old Testament in the Light of Recent Research" is full of information, but is somewhat heavy reading. Mr. Murphy writes on Romans vii. 25, and Dr. R. Johnstone, on 1 Tim. iii. 16—on the exegesis, not the reading, whereon we hope no one ever will write again, for all that can possibly be said has been, over and over and over again.

"A LIFE OF JOSEPH HALL, D.D., BISHOP OF EXETER AND NORWICH." By the Rev. George Lewis, B.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1886. Pp. 451.

WHEN we have said that Mr. Lewis writes with the fullest desire to be fair and candid, we fear we have said all we can say in praise of this book. Why Mr. Lewis rescued Bishop Hall from oblivion we cannot possibly think, for we can find little to admire in his hero, and very much that is absolutely contemptible. At his best he stood far lower than the giants of the period, and at his worst he appears in a most unfavourable light. He had a very large idea of his own importance, and was quite of opinion that Providence and patrons should provide for him; which the latter did, most bountifully. Other men resigned posts so that Hall might have them, and when opponents were dangerous, Hall prayed for them, like Mr. Pecksniff did. There was one, Mr. Lilly, "a little man and a great taker of tobacco," who, when Hall got the living of Hawstead—"by female influence," Mr. Lewis says, for Sir Robert, the patron, did not like him, which does not surprise us—seemed likely to be troublesome. "This dangerous opponent," Mr. Lewis says, "occasioned Hall no small anxiety, and had he not been early removed, could not have failed to be a perpetual torment. How he was taken away is thus told: 'Hereupon I confess, finding the obduredness and hopeless condition of that man, I bent my prayers against him; beseeching God daily, that He would be pleased to remove by some means or other that apparent hindrance to my labours: Who gave me an answer accordingly, for this malicious man, going up hastily to London to exasperate my patron against me, was then and there swept away by the pestilence, and never returned to do any further mischief.'" Have we not done Mr. Pecksniff some injustice?

At Hawstead, Hall married, or as he puts it: "The uncouth solitariness of my life, and the extreme incommodity of that single housekeeping, drew my thoughts, after two years, to condescend to the necessity of a married estate, which God no less strangely provided for me." This is the first time we have ever heard of a man "condescending" to be married; but however much Hall may wrap up the affair in unctuous phraseology, his marriage was arranged for him behind his back, and he was simply told to go and marry Miss Winniff, which he duly did, and we hope she liked him.

We have neither space nor inclination to follow Hall after he became a bishop; we can only add that Mr. Lewis's book confirms our opinion that Lord Macaulay did the Stuarts great injustice. They were a weak and unfortunate race—unfortunate especially in being surrounded by some of the meanest and most contemptible of flatterers that ever disgraced a court, and amongst the worst was Bishop Hall. Professor Masson accuses Hall of "toadying Laud in secret," and of "meanness," to which latter charge Mr. Lewis replies, "if it be found anywhere, it will be found in his relations to absolutism, and *perhaps* [the italics are not ours] in an occasional artificial handling of texts for controversial purposes." Even this weak defence is too strong. There was more manliness in John Knox's little finger than in Bishop Hall's whole body, and had our Bishops been such as he, the Stuarts might all have died at peace.

We hope Mr. Lewis will be more fortunate in his choice of a subject for his next biography.

"SHORT STUDIES IN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY." By the Rev. H. N. Oxenham. (Chapman and Hall.) Pp. 402. 1886.

THIS is a most interesting volume, treating of various subjects, from "Christianity between two foes," and

"Christian and Pagan Art," Iconoclasm, down to Strauss, Dr. Cumming, Archbishop Tait, "Dean Close and the Evangelicals," and compares very favourably with his other work, "Short Studies, Ethical and Religious," which we noticed some time ago.

The first article is entitled "Christianity between two foes," which is well-written and shows great research. We cull the following :—

A distinguishing feature of the last half-century has been the revival of artistic taste and culture in the service of religion throughout Europe, of which the so-called Ritualistic movement is one subordinate phase, but alongside of this Ecclesiastical restoration there has grown up a religion of art, independent of theological restraints, and looking on them much as the Roman and Florentine *literati* of the Renaissance looked on the reforms of Savonarola.

In many respects this is perfectly true. Not only has there been the revival of vestments and other things in the Church of England ; but we see around us improvements in architecture and a growing desire for the beautiful. Even the various Dissenting bodies are not content to worship in the plain structures which satisfied their forefathers, but have gone in for handsome buildings, adorned with towers and spires, which a former generation would have condemned just as much as the earlier Puritans did the "steeple-houses" of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The article on the "Rise and Growth of Ultramontanism" is very suggestive, and at the same time instructive. In the Roman Church, in addition to the three-fold order of bishops, priests, and deacons, there are also cardinals, and the following is given us as an authority for them :—

When, soon after (*i.e.*, the appointment of Cardinal Beaufort to the purple), Kemp, Archbishop of York, was made a cardinal, the Pope ruled that he should take precedence, as such, of the Primate of all England, on the curious ground that the cardinals were "those venerable priests mentioned by Moses in Deuteronomy, and that they were afterwards instituted by St. Peter,"

which is certainly a twisting and warping of Scripture, so much so that we feel inclined to ask for chapter and verse for such a statement—but which, says the author,

Reminds one of M. About's equally remarkable statement at the opening of his pamphlet on the Roman question that the Catholic Church is governed by a Pope and seventy cardinals, in memory of Christ and the twelve Apostles.

The article on "Latin Hymnology" is equally good as showing great research, for there is no subject so interesting as this, nor one which has occupied the minds of writers of all kinds as this, and he truly says that

Two of the ancient creeds—the Nicene and the *Quicunque vult* are hymns as well as creeds, and may be said to celebrate an epoch in the onward march of the Church, as well as in the elaboration of her doctrinal system.

We question whether those who are in favour of removing what are known as the "Damnatory Clauses" in the Athanasian Creed, will agree with the writer in this matter. We also learn that Dr. Arnold used to call the Nicene creed, "a triumphant hymn of thanksgiving," and made a point of having it always chanted at the services of Rugby School Chapel.

There is an interesting article on "Black and Bloody Gardiner," a phrase used by Sir William Harcourt some years ago at the time of the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act, and it would seem to be the writer's object to show that the words do not properly apply to Gardiner, for he says :—

There may be some *primâ facie* ground—though it is really nothing more—for speaking of the bloody banner, but there is not even any plausible pretext for affixing such an epithet to Gardiner.

He also adds—

And it is only fair to remember that Gardiner, unlike some of his contemporaries, did not seek to impose upon others a faith to which he himself was indifferent.

There is an extremely interesting article on "The Festival of Christmas," which is full of thought and very suggestive. And in an article on Scotch Calvinism, in which he speaks strongly of their intolerance, we find a statement which, if true, would, we suppose, gladden the hearts of Lord Nelson and the members of the Home Re-union Society, viz. :—

It has even been rumoured that, in the event of Disestablishment, a large section of the ministers of the Kirk would pass over to the Episcopal Church and bring their flocks with them, not indeed from any abstract preference for Episcopacy, but in pursuit of a wider freedom than the Presbyterian platform seems likely to afford them.

We are much pleased with the article on "Preaching—Ancient and Modern," and in it we find the following on the much-vexed question of written *versus* extempore—or unwritten—sermons :—

Reading sermons is a peculiarity, and a comparatively modern peculiarity, of the Church of England ; it is almost unknown, and would scarcely be tolerated in other communions, Catholic or Protestant, as neither would it be tolerated in Parliament, or at a public meeting, or in a law court. It does not of course follow that sermons, any more than speeches, should not be carefully prepared.

Here we think that the writer makes a sweeping statement, and one which cannot be substantiated. If he will visit some of the Congregational Chapels he will find a great many preachers use the MS. in the pulpit, and we remember reading of Edward Irving, who was a minister of the Scotch Presbyterian Church before he formed the so-called Catholic Apostolic Church, that in his early days he used to read his sermons in the pulpit, and if Mr. Spurgeon does not use his MS. in the pulpit, certain it is that his sermons are written out fully, and can be purchased every week.

We confess to some feeling of disappointment in the article on Dr. Cumming, which is certainly conceived in a bitter spirit, not but that the worthy doctor had his faults and peculiarities as well as other men, but we do not all see things through the same spectacles. Neither do we altogether agree with the article on the late Dean Stanley—the tone is much too bitter. On the other hand, the article on Archbishop Tait is extremely good.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barber, Rev. Edward, M.A., Canon of Chester Cathedral.
Edgington, Rev. C. N., Vicar of Wellesbourne, Warwick ; Rector of St. Peter's, March.
Gallwey, Rev. F. H. Payne, B.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Lewisham ; Vicar of Kirby Knowle, Yorkshire.
Green, Rev. Richard Eling, B.A., Vicar of St. Olave's, Mileend ; Vicar of Steeple Morden.
Houldsworth, Rev. William Thomas, Curate of St. Peter's, Eaton Square ; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Wells Street.
Johns, Rev. Joseph, late Curate of Neath ; Vicar of St. Lythan's, Glamorganshire.
Lewis, Rev. W. A., M.A., Senior Curate of Wakefield ; Vicar of St. James's, Thornes.

Lewman-Brown, Rev. John Bernard, M.A., licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Matthews, Rev. Frank, Curate of St. John-the-Evangelist, Dumfries; Vicar of Clayton-cum-Frickley, Yorkshire.
Mullins, Rev. E. Herbert, Chaplain of the Camberwell Workhouse and Infirmary; Vicar of Scarcliffe and Upper Langwith, Derby.
Oxenham, Rev. George William, Rector of Whatton-in-the-Vale, Notts.
Partridge, Rev. C., Curate of Lapworth, near Birmingham; Curate-in-Charge of Nuneaton.
Pater, Rev. C. D., Curate of St. Michael and All Angels, Wigan; Vicar of St. Anne's, Liverpool.
Paterson, Rev. Charles, B.A., Senior Curate of Harpenden, St. Albans.
Perkins, Rev. T. N., Vicar of Steeple; Vicar of Barkingside.
Phillips, Rev. E. O., M.A., Chancellor of St. David's Cathedral, and Vicar of Aberystwyth, Cardiganshire; Rector of Letterston-with-Llanfair, Nantygof, Pembrokeshire, and Rural Dean of Fishguard.
Prior, Rev. Alfred Hall, Curate of St. John's, Derby; Vicar of St. Barnabas, Derby.
Pugh, Rev. John, Vicar of Llanbadarnfawr; Rural Dean of Llanbadarnfawr.
Scott, Rev. G. H., Curate of St. John's, Bowling, Bradford; Vicar of Christ Church, Lofthouse.
Sloman, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Head Master of the Birkenhead School, Birkenhead; licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Stopford, Rev. J. B., B.A., Curate of Audlem, Nantwich; Curate-in-Charge of St. Andrew's district, in the parish of St. John's, Smallbridge.
Taylor, Rev. George Richard, M.A., Curate of Kedleston, Derbyshire.
Tyas, Rev. J., Vicar of Padiham.
Whitley, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Bedlington; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Newcastle.
Wilson, Rev. Henry, Rector of Dowles, Bewdley.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barham, Rev. Richard Harris Dalton, formerly Rector of Lolworth, at Dawlish, on the 28th ult., aged 70.

Browne, Rev. L. H., M.A., Vicar of Monk Sherborne, sometime Fellow of the Queen's College, Oxford, at Penzance, on Easter Day, aged 45.

Burlton, Rev. Francis Jenks, M.A., Vicar of South Benfleet, at South Benfleet Vicarage, on the 29th ult., aged 77.

Hewett, Rev. John William, at Claybrooke, Leicestershire, on Tuesday in Holy Week, aged 62.

King, Rev. Richard Henry, M.A., at Little Glemham Rectory, on the 28th ult., aged 62.

McBean, Rev. James, formerly and for thirty-five years Librarian to the University of that place, at St. Andrew's, Fifeshire, on the 26th ult., aged 91.

Perrins, Rev. Peter, M.A., for many years Vicar of Great Cornard, at 46, Brompton Crescent, on the 1st inst., aged 87.

Sedger, Rev. Thomas, M.A., at Fundenhall Vicarage, near Wymondham, on the 1st. inst., aged 73.

Williams, Rev. John St. George, late Rector of Clonbullogue, King's County, at Abbey View, Monkstown, on the 28th ult.

Williamson, Rev. Thomas Pym, Vicar of Little Brickhill, on the 27th ult., aged 76.

## AN INTERESTING VISIT.

Extract from an article in *The Fountain*.

THE other day I had the privilege of spending an hour in the consulting-rooms of a medical electrician who bids fair to make himself a great reputation. Although Mr. B. Copson Garratt does not place himself so prominently before the public as do some others in his profession, I have good reason to believe that he is doing a work which is scarcely less extensive, and certainly is not less effective than theirs. Mr. Garratt is a man who likes to work in a quiet way. I think, however, that such a man ought to be better known. He is an enthusiast—albeit a very sober one. He will talk to you by the hour about medical electricity, in which he is, of course, thoroughly well up, and he never tires of showing you its wondrous effects. If you ask him why he goes into raptures over this remarkable therapeutic agent, he will give you two very good reasons—the first is that it gave him new life, and the second is that it has given new life to others. Mr. Garratt knows, and therefore speaks.

After giving me a little Galvanism, which had no more serious effect than to make my hands feel a little sleepy, Mr. Garratt converted the current into what is termed constant instead of induced, and assured me there was just as much Electricity passing through my body as would be sufficient in the other form to kill me. As an illustration of the penetrative power of Magnetism, I may mention that I held in front of me a mariner's compass, and Mr. Garratt held behind me one of his Magnetic bands, and in a moment the Magnetic current passed through my clothing—and I had a very heavy overcoat on—and through my body, and laid hold of the hand of the compass. This is the mighty force which Mr. Garratt infuses into and sends right through the system of his patient, producing the most astonishing and beneficial results.

Some of the most startling scientific discoveries of the present age are based upon Magnetic principles, and the efficacy of Magnetism as a healer promises to lead to results quite as startling as any that have attended it in other directions. Here let me repeat that Magnetism is not Galvanism. The latter, as I understand, often fails, and even when it succeeds it is open to the objection that its effect is too powerful. In skilful hands it has been and may be used with success; but it is, nevertheless, in its application often of a painfully irritating character, because it must come into direct contact with the body, requiring the nerves as a conducting medium. Mr. Garratt does not claim to have made any new discovery, but he has found out how to use Electricity in the most efficient and practical way.

Magnetism does not supersede ordinary medicines, but can be used in conjunction with them without at all affecting or being affected by their action. Its chief value is that it will reach cases which ordinary medicine will not touch. Take paralysis. The doctor does not, cannot, cure paralysis; but Mr. Garratt can point you to people who were bedridden, and, to all appearance, bedridden for life, but whom, thanks to Magnetism, have left their couch, and are now engaged in the active work of life. Long-standing cases of epilepsy and spinal irritation have also been cured. I take these cases from a pamphlet of Mr. Garratt's, where full names and addresses are given, and which will be sent post free to any person who will write to his consulting-rooms, 16, Finsbury Square, London, E.C. Ordinary medicines are of little avail in chronic cases of long standing; but these are just the cases that Mr. Garratt likes to undertake. Another class of sufferers who derive incalculable benefit from Magnetism are people of over-worked brain. In such cases the physician usually prescribes complete rest and a total change of air, medicine being of little use. Mr. Garratt affirms that he can give the overworked man all the benefit that he would derive from rest and change, and give it to him in a very much quicker, simpler, and cheaper way. It will be seen, therefore, that Mr. Garratt's system is not opposed to the efforts of others who are battling with disease; on the contrary, it is an auxiliary which may be used in conjunction with and as a supplement to them.

Having spent many years of patient, laborious, and continued study in adapting his treatment to some of the most obscure and intractable affections, Mr. Garratt now claims, as the result of his professional career, to have attained a success unparalleled in the healing art. Those who desire further information on his method of treatment should peruse his essays, explaining the radical effect of Magnetism upon the human organism in health and disease. It is Mr. Garratt's careful study to adapt the remedy to the requirements of each case—a practice based upon the principles laid down in his published essays, which can be obtained post free on application. He will always be able to confer with any scientific or medical gentleman, either personally or by letter, upon any phase of the subject, or any case for treatment, and will send a private list of 1,000 names, as referees, to any address.—B. COPSON GARRATT, Medical Electrician, 16, Finsbury Square, London, E.C.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## CHRIST WASHING HIS DISCIPLES' FEET.

By the Very Rev. JOHN C. MACDONNELL, D.D., Residentiary of Peterborough.

Sermon preached in Peterborough Cathedral.

"If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet."—John xiii. 14.

CHRIST washing His disciples' feet has a two-fold interest for us. First, as teaching, by symbols, a lesson of deep spiritual import. Second, as affording an example of practical love to our neighbour.

The story is found only in the fourth Gospel. There we are told (xiii. 4, 5), Jesus "riseth from supper and laid aside His garments, and took a towel and girded Himself. After that He poureth water into a bason, and began to wash His disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded." To understand this we must remember that it was an ordinary duty of hospitality, in the East, to supply water for washing the feet of the guests, and that this duty was usually performed by a slave. The oriental custom was to take off the sandals and wash the feet, and then to recline upon a sofa or divan during the meal.

How astonished the disciples must have been to see their Lord and Master rise from table, lay aside His outer, flowing garment, gird Himself up after the manner of a slave, and then proceed to pour water into a basin and wash the disciples' feet. It seems probable that He came to St. Peter first and that he, when he spoke, expressed the feelings of the other apostles; though, as usual, with more warmth and earnestness than they would have done.

St. Peter had doubtless watched his Lord's movements closely till he saw Him actually commencing to wash his feet; and then he repulsed Him with the indignant remonstrance, "Lord, dost Thou wash my feet?" We cannot help admiring the spirit that prompted this mistaken remonstrance, and remembering that it was Peter who had been the first to make the confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus gently but firmly persisted in what He was doing, adding, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt understand hereafter." How true this was of all His acts and teaching. His apostles as yet only partially understood them. By little and little they were learning the meaning of what He said and did. It was not till He had ascended, and the Holy Ghost had been poured out, that fuller light broke in upon their minds.

Even so it is with us now. Though we believe that we are under the fatherly guidance of God, we often fail to discern the goal to which He is leading us, or to understand what befalls us by the way. Clouds and darkness often surround our path, and we cry out, at times, with fear and pain at what we meet in our course. We are ready enough to acknowledge God's fatherly care while all is as we wish. But when some perplexing disappointment, some harrowing trouble falls upon us, we shrink back appalled. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that to be God's doing which we entirely fail to understand. But let us remember at such times these words of Christ. How many a soul, weighed down by grief and perplexity, has been comforted by these words, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt understand hereafter."

But Peter, earnest and impetuous as usual, did not yet submit. He says, "Thou shalt never wash my feet." The answer of Jesus, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me," brought Peter for the first time to a sense of his mistake. He catches a glimpse of a deeper purpose, and a spiritual meaning underlying his Lord's act. Now he begins to see that this, like all Christ's acts, had for its object the good of others. With characteristic vehemence he yields to a sudden revulsion of feeling, and exclaims, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." His answer was as much as to say, "If it were, as I at first thought, a mere menial act of bodily service, I could not bear you to do it for me; but if it be part of your work of mercy and love as the Saviour of my soul, then I cannot have enough of a cleansing so precious. 'Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head.'"

But here again, Christ gently rebukes the ardour which was now rushing into an opposite extreme, and He tells the apostle that what He was doing was sufficient for the end which He had in view. He says, in words which at once shed a new light upon the spiritual meaning of the act, "He that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit."

There is a fulness of meaning here, which is lost in our English Bible, but has been restored in the New Version. "Washed" here means plunged in a bath—bathed. Christ takes as the basis of His teaching here, the obvious fact that if a man before coming to a feast has taken a bath, he needs only, on arriving at the place of entertainment, to wash off the dust which has adhered to his feet upon the way, and is once more pure, "clean every whit." Thus our Lord bases His spiritual teaching here as elsewhere, upon the common usages of society around Him, one of which was to supply

water to wash their feet, before the guests reclined at the table.

But what was the spiritual truth corresponding to this familiar fact which our Lord meant to teach? It is this—He who is pardoned and cleansed by entering into the Christian covenant, who "believeth and is baptized," is clean in the sight of God, and needs only to be cleansed from the sins and defilements of his daily walk. Christ can scarcely have used the word "bathed," cleansed in a bath, without alluding to that baptismal bath which he ordained as the sign and seal of entrance into His covenant and kingdom, and which St. Paul calls the bath or "laver of regeneration." He could scarcely couple cleansing with the water of a bath without some reference to the "one baptism for the remission of sins." But He who cleanses all once, when He receives them into His family, must still cleanse them daily, or they have no part with Him. Yea, Lord, wash Thou our feet daily; for even though we love Thee, we have "erred and strayed from Thy ways like lost sheep; we have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts."

You see then that the washing of the disciples' feet was a symbol of a most vital spiritual truth. There are many earnest religious teachers in our day, though not of our Church, who lay little stress upon the promises made to us in baptism, and who yet lay down most strongly that he who is really converted to God, and believes that his sins are forgiven, has henceforth, so to speak, nothing to do with sin. He is done, according to them, with confessions of sin, and supplications for pardon. He has not to seek for a salvation to be attained, but to rejoice in a salvation already possessed. Now there is much truth in this language, because, like most religious errors, it arises from a one-sided view of truth; from men looking at some texts as it were with a magnifying glass, while in so doing they lose sight of others equally important. Yes, there is one complete cleansing from sin (so far they are right) for all who enter into the Christian covenant, a cleansing typified by the plunging into the baptismal waters. Henceforth they are by covenant not servants, but beloved children, the objects of a Father's love, and a Saviour's care, who may rejoice in the enjoyment of present peace and the hope of coming glory. Why then, such persons say, should believers be for ever repeating confessions of sin, and asking for a pardon already acquired? To such the daily confessions of our Prayer Book seem tiresome and unnecessary at the least; still more out of place they consider the more humble confession of sin in our Communion Service, in which, before joining with angels and archangels in the highest act of praise, we bend the knee and say of our sins, that "the remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burden of them is intolerable." Such persons cannot understand this combination of penitence and praise, of humiliation and rejoicing. Nay, some have even dared to refuse to use the Lord's Prayer, because it asks for the forgiveness of our trespasses against God, as if the prayer in which they call God their Father, was unfit for His redeemed children. On all such perversions of the Gospel, our Lord's words and acts in this thirteenth chapter of St. John, throw a flood of light. Nothing that such teachers can say about the pardon of believers is stronger than the words of Christ, "He that is bathed, is clean every whit." But Christ adds the condition which they leave out, the washing away the sins and defilements of our daily walk, the washing of the feet, which is of such importance that he said, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me." We have the full truth set forth in these two sentences, "He that is bathed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit"; and "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me."

Thus you will see that our daily confessions and absolutions do not exclude, but pre-suppose and imply our thorough cleansing previously by "Him who loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood."

But there is another side to this great truth, which seems to me expressed in those almost prophetic words of Peter, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head."

But it may be said, surely St. Peter spoke those words in error, and was corrected by our Lord. That is true. What St. Peter asked for then, his Lord refused as being unnecessary. But would He have thus spoken after the apostle's signal fall? St. Peter needed not the washing of his hands and his head then: but did he not express in these words what he was so soon to need, and what many have needed, and still need? I think we may without presumption carry our Lord's illustration a little further. He who having had the full cleansing of a bath, walked along the streets of an Eastern city to a feast, had but to take off his sandals and to have his feet washed from the dust of the journey, and sit down, or rather recline, at the banquet provided for him; a perfect type of the consistent faithful believer, who daily receives pardon for the failures and infirmities of his daily walk, till he takes his place at the heavenly feast, at the "marriage supper of the Lamb."

But others there are (are they not a great number?), who contract more defilement than the unavoidable dust of their daily walk on earth. They resemble guests who walk or ride to their destination by rugged and perilous ways, and who often miss their track, and get severe and dangerous falls; at times on the point of sinking hopelessly in a quagmire; at others bruised and maimed by the misadventures of their journey, and who, when they reach a resting-place, do so with their clothes torn and spattered, unfit to appear as guests at a banquet till they have received more than the

washing of their feet. Such may cry out in the words of Peter, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head."

It is for such that careful self-examination and resolute self-denial are most needful. Such discipline is useless, except to those who are earnest and true disciples; but their chief use is for those who have not merely soiled their feet in their earthly walk, but suffered by many a fall in rugged and miry places, where they had wandered from the right path. Surely our Lord would in such cases hear and respond to the passionate cry, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head."

But I must not dwell exclusively upon the spiritual truths of which the washing of the disciples' feet was a symbol, and of which, but for the resistance of St. Peter, we might have known little. Plainly our Lord had a purpose in His act quite irrespective of this. The symbolical lesson drops almost out of sight when He proceeds to instruct His disciples as to the meaning of what He had done. We are told (vv. 12-16), "After He had washed their feet, and had taken His garments, and was sat down again, He said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well: for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily I say unto you the servant is not greater than his lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." Observe the example is what He dwells upon: and He adds, knowing how difficult they would find it to follow, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."

What a marvellous light this throws upon "the mind that was in Christ Jesus" on the one hand, and on the dulness and selfishness of His disciples on the other. Remember how solemn the occasion was, Christ's last evening with His apostles; and how strange and unexpected the act itself was. How solemnly St. John prefaces the story. He says (v. 1), "When Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father." And again (v. 3), "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He was come from God and went to God; He riseth from supper." The washing of His disciples' feet was an act, as we are here assured, done in the full consciousness of His divinity, and of His approaching departure. It was no passing incident of secondary importance, but one that was intended to stamp its impression deeply and indelibly upon Christ's Church and people. It was meant to strike the very keynote of Christian practice. "I have given you an example that you should do as I have done to you." Here then we seem to come to the very central principle of that love which animated Christ, and which ought to be reflected in the character of His people.

If this incident be viewed cursorily and superficially, our Lord seems merely to have taught His disciples a lesson of humility. He who was Lord and Master voluntarily assumed the position of a servant. As He had before said (Matt. xx. 28): "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

It is the same lesson as that which St. Paul teaches (Phil. ii. 5-8): "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant." There the humility dwelt upon was Christ's emptying Himself of His divine glory to assume human flesh—"the form of a servant." But when washing His disciples' feet, He lays aside even His human dignity as their Master and Teacher, and from love performs the office of a servant.

But there was much more in this act than what we commonly mean by humility. There was more than the mere absence of pride or regard for the dignity which was justly His. It taught the active and earnest principle of love—the effort to serve others, to do them good, however inferior they might be, and however incapable of understanding the acts and motive of their Benefactor. Our Lord intended to teach them not only to lay aside pride and self-assertion, but to be ready to do good offices to all, even though it might be humiliating and troublesome and disagreeable so to do. Wherever any man or woman is placed in a more advantageous position than those around, whether as to intellect, or knowledge, or grasp of religious truth, or wealth, or social position, there is the call to render to others the service that genuine love alone will give. "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye ought also to wash one another's feet."

But how may you who hear me carry out this principle and follow this example? The outward act of washing the feet is one which has long passed out of the duties of hospitality and the customs of society. But each age brings its own objects for the application of every true principle. Perhaps there never was an age when this example was more needed. The outward violence which defaced former states of society has indeed happily passed away. But there is a coldness and selfishness in this our hardworking age, which concentrates our thoughts upon self-interest, and leads many almost to despise and sneer at unselfish kindness and genuine Christian love. At such a time we need to drink deeply the spirit of Christ's act, to exercise ourselves in a thousand ways in imitating it. We need it for ourselves, for our growth in true piety and holiness; we need it for others, whose future is by God's appointment

placed, to a great extent, in our hands. Yes, brethren and sisters in Christ, you have, I hope, accepted Him as your portion for ever; you have, I trust, given yourselves to Him, that He may wash your feet, and "make you clean every whit." But you have also to follow the example set you by Him. You have to ask yourselves solemnly each one: "Lord, what wilt Thou have *me* to do." What is the work which in God's providence is placed within my reach, and which the spirit of the text binds me to do? If Christ, my Lord and Master, washed His disciples' feet, what acts of kindness am I called on to do to those around me?

And if in discharging these duties you meet, as you often will, with misconception and ingratitude, remember that your Master was repulsed even by a loving Apostle, who could no understand His motive or appreciate His act. Where would be our hopes now, if Christ were to depart in haste from those who could not at once understand and honour Him? No, in these things you must look not at man's treatment of you, but at Christ's example and the approval of God.

Take, then, as your motto, in all works of kindness and charity, these words of Christ. Take them as your guide in relieving want and suffering; still more take them as your guide, when trying to lead others to a higher and better cleansing—even to Him who said: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me." Take these words and let them sink deep into your hearts. "Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am. If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet.' For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you."

## REASONABLE INQUIRY *v.* REPREHENSIBLE DOUBTING.

By the Rev. A. D. PRINGLE, M.A., Vicar of Blakeney, Gloucestershire.

Sermon Preached at Blakeney on Easter Sunday, 1886.

"Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest His disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead; so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them: Ye have a watch; go your way, make it as sure as ye can."—Matt. xxvii. 63-65.

THE character of Pilate is one deserving our careful attention. The words and actions of Pilate during the trial of our Lord and subsequently would not have been so carefully recorded by the four Evangelists unless they had intended all who read to weigh with care his strange actions and strange words. From these we are allowed to draw our own inferences.

I. Let us notice the differing views held on the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

II. We may draw some inferences from Pilate's strange acts and strange words after Christ's crucifixion, showing the continued struggle in his mind between belief and unbelief.

III. This is notable, because the same mental struggle is going on in many men of some age who are thoughtful; while many younger men dismiss all these subjects, about which the Roman Pilate could feel interested and thoughtful, with little or no thought.

I. "Crucified under Pontius Pilate" can awaken very different thoughts in believers and unbelievers. There are those who believe in the Christ as an historical personage and no more; their feelings are only those of pity, that human self-deception could carry the man Jesus to such a death. Others are unbelievers only in Christ's vicarious sacrifice for the sins of men; they go far beyond the unhappy disbeliever in Christ's "meretorious death and passion" and His Divine character: with them, His death is no subject of pity, and they are far from contempt at His death. They revere His whole nature and character, they worship His death as a perfect example of self-sacrifice, and rejoice every Easter day in "His glorious resurrection and ascension." Many more, we trust, are still believers in all those declarations of the prophets and the New Testament, that "Christ died for our sins, and that he was buried and the third day rose again." We see this fact contained in the fifth chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians. St. Paul was able to receive truths regarding Christ in the Old Testament and repeat them more clearly and cogently as the Gospel for man's salvation; surely we may be content to accept his teaching, without feeling bound to explain the hidden things of God. Hear the words of St. Paul, and bear in mind that he wrote only what other apostles affirm, "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again." God hath reconciled us unto Himself by Jesus Christ: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself: for He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."

If we accept those words of the creed, "crucified under Pontius Pilate" with our hearts alive to the whole history, we shall regard them as a minute but very full picture: in the foreground we have pain and scorn and death, in the immediate background, we see a solemn procession of a few but devoted and fearless followers, bearing His sacred body to the tomb; while, still further, we see Christ's glorified form issuing from the sepulchre, appearing here to one, there to more of His

followers on earth. Such is the vision which I believe will arise before the believing and rejoicing Christian, most completely on Easter Sunday as the complement of Good Friday. The worship of a dead Christ is in these days so enlarged on in connection with Good Friday, and such a superstitious view is taken of the Holy Communion, that men have to make more than ordinary effort to believe in the realities of Easter day, and then to regard the Lord's day as "an Easter day in every week."

II. The judge who passed an unjust sentence of death upon our Blessed Lord had not the aids to faith which we have; yet his deeper thoughts and feelings as a man were moved to deep misgivings after Jesus Christ's death and concerning His rising again. His struggle between belief and unbelief, during the trial of Jesus, has been brought before us by another preacher during the last week. You were told of the unworthy motives which Pilate allowed to overpower his judgment; perhaps not so much from fear of the people or desire to gratify a popular cry, but rather from the fear of making more enemies than he had done already, knowing that a remonstrance had gone to Rome, complaining of his government. This mental struggle went on. We will now follow still further this conflict in Pilate's mind, after the condemnation of Jesus. In St. Matthew, 27th chapter, compared with St. Mark, 15th chapter, we have materials to bear us out in our idea that this struggle was not likely to cease. Three events separate but still connected, are recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark. First, Joseph of Arimathæa begging of Pilate the body of Jesus for interment. Secondly, Pilate questioning the centurion as to the death of Jesus having actually happened. Thirdly, the Chief Priests and Pharisees waiting on Pilate with the request that the stone might be sealed and a watch set.

1. St. Mark's account of the interment of Jesus is the fullest and most interesting. "Joseph of Arimathæa, an honourable counsellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus." There is no hint given that in acting thus Joseph desired that the Scripture should be fulfilled, "He made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in His death." We may believe that his views regarding the Messiah were not the same as those of his countrymen. Intercourse with Jesus as one of his disciples had taught a few rich men, like Matthew, and Zaccheus, and Joseph of Arimathæa, some higher and more spiritual views of the Messiah as the Hope and Consolation of Israel; but it does not follow that Joseph, any more than the apostles, read, in all their spiritual and truthful meaning, their own prophetic books.

We may suppose the request of Joseph to have been made very shortly after our Lord's death, between three o'clock and six o'clock, before which later hour his enemies wished the body of Jesus removed from the cross.

I regard this act of Joseph, the rich counsellor amongst the Jews, begging the body of Jesus, as calculated to keep alive the struggle in Pilate's mind as to the real character of the falsely accused whom he had crucified, believing Him to be a just man with no fault. The request was not made by a poor and ignoble follower. A counsellor and a member of the Sanhedrim was a man of mark amongst Jews; but a decidedly rich citizen, by a man of Pilate's known character, would be much more thought of, when he came forward in such a conspicuous manner to ask a favour, more as a demand than a favour. Judging Pilate—as you would judge any man in authority who knew very well the character of the accusers, and formed a quick opinion of the accused—it is only common justice to suppose, that the request for the body of Jesus conveyed a courageous belief in the claims of Jesus. If such a request, under all the surrounding circumstances, did not carry on the past struggle in Pilate's mind as to the nature and character of our Lord, we must think of Him very differently to the evidence conveyed by the evangelists.

2. We are thus brought to the second event, St. Mark xv. 44: "Pilate marvelled if He were already dead: and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead." We may infer that Pilate openly expressed his disbelief as to the actual death of Jesus. He might suppose, from the heroic conduct of Jesus before the judgment seat, that death in his case would not be more speedy than was usual from crucifixion; that His spirit would not succumb sooner than that of other men. The lingering nature of death from crucifixion was so well known, that Pilate's wonder was all the more natural. St. Mark's minuteness is very suggestive in mentioning Pilate's question, "Whether he had been any while dead." The death of the Crucified, when so unexpected, was not calculated to quiet the mind of His judge. Pilate had given his orders that the legs of the two others crucified with Him should be broken to hasten their death; but in the case of Him on whom his doubting mind had dwelt, no such request had been made. This is not a fact connected with the crucifixion on which any one likes to dwell. The fact is barely mentioned, and human feeling may wish it had been omitted; but it has a place in proving the fulfilment of Scripture; therefore, however revolting, it finds a place in the gospel history. If I allude to it, it is only because the order was given by Pilate. His Roman mind might have been hardened by familiarity with the death of crucifixion, breeding contempt for its agonies; but the contrast between the request being made for two undoubted criminals, and not made against one whom his accusers regarded as a criminal, was too apparent

and striking not to make some impression on a mind already awake to thought as to the real character of Jesus, keeping alive the idea that He was no ordinary man.

3. We pass to the third recorded event, between the hours of three o'clock and six o'clock. We find this detailed at most length in St. Matthew, 27th chapter, verses 62-66. We may presume (nothing more, for it is only presuming) that the chief priests and Pharisees had some knowledge of the request and intention of Joseph as to the burial of Jesus. Such a presumption is not groundless. It seems in some way to account for this deputation waiting on Pilate, and losing no time in making their request. We can imagine the anger felt by those enemies of Jesus, when two members of their highest tribunal, the Sanhedrim, Joseph and Nicodemus, publicly took down His body from the cross, wrapped it in costly linen and costly spices, and put it in the tomb expressly designed for the rich man of Arimathæa. It is not unreasonable to allow that priestly animosity might have its struggles between belief and unbelief; they might be fearful that He who had raised the dead might "rise again the third day," but it was most convenient to give it another turn, "lest His disciples come by night and steal Him away." It was a pitiful subterfuge.

Let us still judge Pilate as a man, a thoughtful though corrupt judge; and this part of the narrative is very helpful in its minuteness; but more than this, it conveys a general idea of the independence, under guidance, under which the evangelists wrote. The absence in the gospel narratives of all attempt at imposition and mere hero-worship is so well known, that the very independence of the narratives carries with it no small difficulty in reconciling their varying testimony; but still we hold to scriptural assertion that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." This truth we may see in the account of the interview of crafty and malicious priests with the half-convinced judge. We see in this account and in many more, conscientious writers not trained as special pleaders. If the evangelists had been trained as special pleaders, I could not own that "they were moved by the Holy Ghost" to write, as St. Matthew does, the account of this interview—for the writer was not present at the interview, therefore it must have been written under inspiration from God. The writer could not have received the account from the speakers. I cannot conceive of so much mean subterfuge and self-condemnation being exposed by the speakers. If we look for a reason why it was handed down to the whole world, we can find a good reason for such publicity, viz., to show all men the character of dishonest priests and prejudiced Pharisees, and to show us more of the working's of Pilate's mind between belief and unbelief.

Observe the opening words of this united deputation of priestly hatred and Pharisaical prejudice, "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, after three days I will rise again." If such a carefully prepared address did not at the outset grate on the ears of Pilate, we must give him credit for very great ignorance—an ignorance which had no place in him—of the character and real sentiments towards the Crucified on the part of the speakers. You must bear in mind the short space of time between the trial and condemnation of Christ and this interview. Pilate had no time to compose his feelings and his doubts. Could he see those malicious priests without being moved to scorn? But which would preponderate, scorn felt for those priests, or anxious fear as to the words of Christ now quoted? Pilate might inwardly disbelieve what they reported, but the darkness and the earthquake were only very recently past. The Roman mind was very practical, but yet it was superstitious. We can have no difficulty in understanding such a contradiction in an age such as this, at once very practical and abounding in superstition. Men of good sense reject a great deal which they hear, but there often remains the difficulty of deciding between the true and the false, the credible and the incredible. Is it unreasonable to suppose that the quoted words of Jesus "The third day I will rise again" left Pilate's mind divided between scorn for the speakers and their request, and doubt as to whether the saying might come true?

When we pass on to the 65th verse of the 27th chapter of St. Matthew, there is certainly anxiety as to the powers of the Crucified. "Ye have a watch: make it as sure as ye can."

No one can say with perfect confidence, that such a view of Pilate's mind and feelings is the right one; but, I believe, the more carefully his character is studied the more it will appear consistent with our human and sinful nature, when choosing the evil as a whole, but not quite blind to the good and the true. If this inconsistency, common to a sinful nature, is felt by ourselves, we can admit it in Pilate's case; yea more, the whole of the history, when we piece together its various items, seems to lead to this conclusion, and to debar us from any other. Granting this double-mindedness, there is something painfully suggestive in what we may call the last words of Pilate. "Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can." No one but He who readeth the hearts of men could tell the Christian world how deep his thoughts might then be concerning "the resurrection from the dead;" but his thoughts, I will allow, might not have been deep thoughts. His mind might have been in a condition of waiting and watching expectance, with some little anxiety, but not a great deal. He might say to himself, "I, the Roman Governor, crucified Jesus; and even if he reappears, could he prevail against me to punish me? Can one so indifferent to worldly glory, so placid and forgiving, so averse to self-defence that

'He answered not a word,' can he act differently if he should come to life?" But what if he tried again to stifle conscience, and again tried to do it without effect! Putting all these events together, I can feel some confidence in concluding that Pilate did feel a good deal of doubt; and if the large money given to the soldiers did not prevent the report of Christ's resurrection reaching the Governor's ears—which we may say for certain it did, for Pilate was no stranger in Jerusalem who could remain ignorant of wonders which all would repeat—then his silence can be explained, for those who brought about our Lord's condemnation knew his openness to bribery and corruption.

III. There is a third matter for reflection. arising out of the foregoing, and bringing our subject down to our own times. This same sort of mental struggle is often found amongst men of riper years, who are thoughtful and anxious, not so much about the various phases of religion as about the central figure in the Christian's creed, Jesus Christ; his Divine Being, the merits of His death, and the realities of His resurrection. There is another class, younger men, who dismiss sacred subjects, touching the death and resurrection of Jesus, with less thought than Pilate, from less of interest and with less enquiry. These classes do not represent two distinct orders of mind, but they do show two different characters. Two men may differ in conduct, one active and willing to work and taking it when he finds it, another is slothful and averse to all labour; but the man willing to work must use effort and must repel idleness, while the slothful and negligent can be useful and active, but will never make the effort.

How can these two characters be dealt with best? The former we regard as the honest enquirer desiring light, the other as dishonest, for he will not use his own powers and the resources around him to satisfy enquiry. We feel sympathy for the real enquirer in all honest doubt; for who has not to struggle with his own difficulties in belief? The man who has no troubles of the kind cannot have troubled himself to think much or very deeply, where so many have their oft-recurring struggle. The class of men to whom our sympathy is due does not glory over its difficulties in faith; a sad course in which too many feel pride. It is our simple duty to do all in our power to help on, if we may, the man who honestly desires "more light," and who tries to gain it. We can draw his attention respectfully to those records which hand down well-attested historical facts. We will not give up our belief in their value as truthful records. If the resurrection of Jesus is hard to receive because we have never seen dead men rise again, we can point to the permission of Pilate to seal the stone, thus shutting out imposture; we can read of the numerous witnesses referred to in the evangelists and by St. Paul, we can point to Jewish and Christian affirmations fully believed by the writers. More than this, there is the practical argument—which not only the history of Christianity exemplifies during many centuries, but daily experience verifies—I mean, the hope and comfort and joy in life now, and in looking into the future, which faith in Christ "dying for our sins and rising for our justification" conveys to so many whose lot on earth has little comfort and joy, except it be enriched by faith in a Saviour, and the hope of seeing Him in a happier state.

If Pilate's anxiety may well read to all its lessons, we cannot set it forth as a matter of comfort to any that, no matter what his faith may be if only his life be right, he can perform the whole duty of man towards the Father, Son, and life-giving Spirit. The mind of the enquirer, if his enquiry and his doubts are honest, will not rest satisfied with such advice conveying no comfort.

We must regard the wants (though too little felt) of another class. I am afraid we must admit that the rising generation of young men, foundation-stones of our nation in the future, are in very many instances unbelievers in Jesus and the resurrection. This is not a mere idea hastily formed. Who could come to such a conclusion in haste? Who would state it without deep regret? There are—be it said with misgiving for the Christian faith and our beloved land—many intelligent young men amongst the upper and working classes, whose spirit of inquiry must rank beneath that of the Roman governor; he condemned Jesus, but yet made some inquiry concerning His kingdom and the charges brought against Him; he wished to know more of Chrift's death, and would seem anxious as whether He would rise again.

It is not going too far to assert that, amongst very many young men the grandest occurrences in connection with the Lord Jesus are contemptuously referred to, as though all men who believed those facts were fools, whereas they themselves are wise. But these are young men with whom our hopes and our love may be bound up—our nation's future depends upon them; let me speak honestly to them if any such are present now. You are not honest doubters. You are not honest inquirers as to the Christ and the Christian faith. Facts commonly reported amongst us you declare undeserving of your regard. You are deceiving yourselves by reposing in the flattery and unbelief of men of like age. You indulge, at your pleasure, in wilful blindness, and you try to make others believe that you are walking in light.

This particular class of Epicurean mind is being wrongly dealt with by many would-be friends, and they are proportionately wronged. Their shallow views are treated with all the consideration due to real inquirers and true thinkers. In ordinary life, young men who set themselves to gainsay truths resting on reliable testimony are not helped up in self-conceit, or praised for their singularity. If their admirers deal thus unkindly by them, more

intercourse with the outside world will probably rub off their higher philosophy, and not very gently. A more reasonable plan of dealing with such dangerous weakness and pride, is to speak the truth—while you speak fearlessly and reasonably, you can speak kindly; but the great facts concerning our Lord are not ours to tone down, but only to keep and guard. Bring before the minds of this class of young men (I address you now as parents and elders), the minds, the characters, the lives of men "who have served their generation by the will of God," men "compassed with like passions as ourselves"; men like St. Paul, who turned from the blasphemer to become the world-honoured defender and exemplifier of the faith, and only took to himself this honour, "by the grace of God I am what I am"; men like St. Peter, who once denied his Lord and Master, who lived long to own his weakness, but moved by the same Holy Spirit, enlightened others; like them, he lived in Christ and died for Christ. If young men wish to study variety in the mind and writings of the defenders of the faith, point them to the Gospel and Epistles of St. John; these captivate the many, but they tell divine truth on the nature of the Lord Jesus, and faith in Him, which the many can read but fewer receive.

We may now turn from these classes and such reflections, more painful than agreeable, to all who rejoice to-day with those who welcomed the risen Lord Jesus on the first Easter morn—we may pray that our hearts may feel while our lips repeat such words as these: "Christ is risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." Christ Jesus "hath brought life and immortality to light," and "he that believeth in Him shall never die." "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." "Blessed are they who have not seen Him, and yet have believed."

These and other like declarations of Holy Writ are not to be lightly given up, when so much of our consolation here, and our hopes in a future life for ourselves, and for those gone before, depend upon our receiving them. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, we believe that those that sleep in Jesus God will bring with Him."

---

It is satisfactory to find that the depression in trade has not interfered with the income of the great missionary societies of the Church. The annual reports just published show an augmentation of revenue for the year with both societies. The Church Missionary Society shows an increase on the year of £3,025, or £835 above the ordinary income of any previous year. The increase of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is £11,169.

For Health and Immortality.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1886.

## NEW POLITICAL TRUTHS.

A SUBSCRIBER demurs to our application last week of the epithet "shrieking" to so great, good, and wise a man as Mr. Gladstone. It was suggested to our mind as we read his recent manifesto to his constituents—a last desperate and despairing shriek for saving his Irish Home Rule Bills. That document enunciated several novel political doctrines. When it is proposed to split up the British Empire, and to hand over a portion of it to its enemies, the author says this is entirely a question of class. The disruption may be against the interests of the men of "station, title, wealth, social influence, and the professions," but the people have no interest whatever in the matter. It cannot affect "the nation" at large, whether its power is weakened, its glory tarnished, its good name made a by-word, its very existence imperilled. On the contrary, "the nation" likes all these things, and may be confidently relied upon to promote them, in spite of the efforts of mere "class, and the dependents of class."

2. All the statesmen of one political party, and very nearly all of the other, are united to promote one great object, and have pronounced an identical verdict on a certain scheme. The author of this scheme stands almost alone among political experts, and tries to prove that he is right and all of them are wrong, from the fact that, while they are divided on other questions, they are in agreement on this. One might have presumed the contrary. Not at all, says Mr. Gladstone, their diversity of judgment on other questions renders their unanimity on this one of no account whatever. They—these men of weight, ability, and experience—are a "secessionist Babel" and nothing more.

3. It is now an admitted truth that the true power of discerning and following the right dwells in the masses of the people, in the agricultural labourers of our counties, and even more in the peasantry of Ireland. In the heart of these people is implanted at birth "wise and generous justice."

The existence of wisdom, generosity, and justice amongst the poorer classes of Irishmen is well known; they have been specially manifest during the last few years. Education is quite fatal to this inborn righteousness of the people. All the educated classes are so saturated with injustice and want of rectitude as to be incapable of coming to a right conclusion. This same simple-minded integrity is also to be found in some places abroad —in America, in Canada, and elsewhere; so that the cause of "wise and generous justice" is supported by "the warm and fraternal sympathy" of Canadian rebels, a result worthy to be weighed against the disapproval of all that is most intelligent in the British nation. On a question involving the well-being and the very existence of the British Empire, it is not the voice of England and Scotland that ought to prevail, but the voice of "capitals such as Washington, Boston, and Quebec." These unverified assertions are held to be confirmed by the records of the past. "It is not the first time in the history of Liberalism when sections under chiefs of high distinction, character, and ability" have broken away into rebellion. Mr. Gladstone does not accuse the "Secessionists" of having abandoned their principles, nor does he affect to deny that he has abandoned his. Yet it is they who are secessionists, not he. They have not abandoned their principles, but they have abandoned *him*, and that is enough. They are the secessionists, and common sense as well as history shows that they will miserably fail. Such are the new political truths placed before the world on the *ipse dixit* of our Prime Minister, who had previously discovered that the enforcement of the Ten Commandments in Ireland was cruel, unjustifiable, and impolitic "coercion." We have often drawn attention to Mr. Gladstone's extraordinary vanity, but this ill-judged and vituperative address transcends anything that we could have imagined possible, even from him. In it he ridicules the judgment of men his superiors in intellect, and vastly his superiors in character and moral integrity. He asserts that Liberals, who remain staunch to their principles, have "seceded"; and that "the secession is as to positive policy for Ireland a perfect Babel"; as if that fact (supposing it true) could constitute a valid reason for accepting his monstrous proposals; and finally and chiefly, in the true demagogic fashion he seeks to create a division by stirring up class rivalries on a question in which the interests of every class of the Queen's subjects are precisely the same. It appeared to us that the issue of this appeal to class hatreds, to the poor and ignorant, and to the "fraternal sympathy" of assassins and murderers, on the eve of a debate in Parliament, was very unbecoming in the Prime Minister of England, and we trust that the treasonable policy it was designed to support will utterly fail.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### FREE TRADE.

SIR,—It is very easy to quibble, but it advances nothing. If your correspondent did not actually say that Free Trade rectifies all wrongs, he has implied that it does. Let this pass.

The high price of gold now stands in the way? There is here an implication. It is a scotch which the force of the wheels of Free Trade will presently break! The question, however, remains—How does it operate? Will "B." kindly give an answer?

"I said that a condition of freedom, both of production and exchange, is that under which the greatest increase of wealth results." This may be a truism, and it may be nothing of the kind. The condition is absolutely impossible, and so it is foolish to occupy time in discussing it. Free Trade, as it exists with us, means—We pay the taxes, the foreigner does not. This state of things is monstrous.

It is practically impossible to judge very much of the motives that influenced Pitt; he is too far removed. The case is altogether different with Mr. Gladstone. There can be no doubt that personal and selfish considerations are the principal factors with him. We cannot otherwise explain his Home Rule scheme. Well, but his conduct is all of a piece, and so his Free Trade work was not the outcome of a mind concerned with the welfare of his country, but that of one calculating his chances of success. His action, therefore, proves nothing.

Some one said, writing of Ireland the other day, that the business of the priest, the publican, and the agitator, was flourishing. The observation was no doubt true, but such trade would add but little wealth to the nation. So of the trades of which "B." speaks —collar-making—does he mean dog-collar?—and extensive branches of machine-making! This is trade, certainly, and deserves that Free Trade should aid in its development!

My knowledge of trade in Germany is the result of observation. This makes a considerable difference. It is clear that German workmen are earning the wages our own workmen ought to be earning. This is a practical point, and more worthy of consideration than finely-spun theories.

The estimate I gave of the tax on farm-produce was not mine, but that of a practical man. It did not include income-tax. The road-rate used to be paid by the whole community, and is now paid by the farmer. These questions in this form are immaterial. The point is, Who should pay the taxes? The British farmer pays them; the foreigner does not. If the foreigner did pay taxes at home (they bear no comparison, be it remarked, with the English farmers'), it is not to the point, for the question is, Who should pay our Government for the privilege of selling? The foreigner comes into our market toll-free; the English farmer pays a heavy toll. This is the point.

"B." should know that, when I complained of his child-like simplicity, I was speaking of his knowledge of facts, and not of his power of expressing himself. We are not dealing, if I may again suggest, with theories or fancies, but with something more tangible.

"B." asserted that to tax articles meant to increase the price to the consumer. I showed that his contention was absurd. He should have dealt with my facts. To make assertions advances nothing. May I remind him that he has not explained how it is farm produce is of such little value? If his theory were true, that cost of production rules the selling price, then the contrary ought to obtain.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, May 8th, 1886.

---

SIR,—In the year 1884, the last for which the returns have as yet been published, we raised 160,757,779 tons of coal. In the same year we exported of coal, coke, and patent fuel 23,350,230 tons. The balance of over 137 million tons may therefore be taken as consumed at home.

Now, to tax the enormous quantities used in our home manufactures would be to prejudice them still further in competition with foreign manufactures; and to tax what is used for strictly domestic consumption (whilst the incidence of this latter taxation would principally be borne by the same class as is already saddled with income-tax), would be to inflict a serious evil on the poor, who in times of privation value firing almost as much as food. H W.

8th May, 1886.

---

SIR—If a tax of a shilling a ton were levied on all coals raised in Great Britain, seeing that three tons of coal are required to make one ton of iron, you at once load iron, at present at about forty shillings, with a weight of seven and a-half per cent.; that is, you extinguish a large part of the trade, possibly, as much as two-thirds of it. Also, you load our steam-shipping trade with a weight which it could not bear, and under which it might expire, and would certainly languish. I do not think that it would be patriotic to destroy two of the most important trades of England.

My statement of the proposition of the incidence of taxation, as in my letter in to-day's PULPIT, should be amended, thus:—The consumer of an article, being within the area of taxation, pays any tax that may be placed on the article. Suppose a tax levied on coal exported; the tax falls, not on the foreign consumer, but on the native producer. Such a tax as towards the foreign purchaser of the coal, is not really a tax, it is a royalty or rent. The Ricardian theory of rent, which is absolutely true, and cannot be excepted against, lays down that rent is not part of the cost of the production of any article; but is that which is paid for exceptional facilities for producing the article. Accordingly, an extra rent or royalty on coal, levied or tried to be levied on foreign consumers, who can get coal elsewhere, is really an impost upon our mine-owners.

There is no indirect tax that can be imagined that does not produce, or that will not produce, such mischiefs, although they may be less in degree, as that on coals which you suggest. That which produces the sum of wealth which is available for the State to tax for public purposes is the labour of the whole community; and every interference with its labour makes the nett product of its labour less in amount. Therefore, to tax indirectly, that is the uncompleted results of labour, instead of the completed results, goes to diminish the whole fund from whence the State derives its financial strength.

If people studied economic science as they do Euclid, this would be as manifest to them as the demonstratation of the fifth proposition of the first book. I do not wish to make remarks that might not be agreeable; but your readers must know the schoolboy's name for that proposition.

B.

8th May, 1886.

---

## THE LARGER HOPE.

SIR,—I was truly glad to see the leading article in the PULPIT of last Saturday, on "Health of the Soul dependent on the Body." I think that line of thought has an important bearing on the questions of the Larger Hope and the Will.

The remarks of Mr. Edmund Lawrence, in the same number of the PULPIT, rather conceal his opinions than expose them. His reference to the conceptions of Leibnitz on the Will was perhaps intended to afford an indication of his own. That brilliant genius seemed to think that our volitions are mainly swayed and governed by unreasoning impressions and constitutional tendencies. Those come to us chiefly from inherited qualities and characteristics, which are all physical. They depend on the structure and conditions of the brain, nerves, and blood; and in very deed and truth, frequently on the care we take of our digestive organs.

Mr. Lawrence apparently admits that "to speak of the freedom of a will enslaved by evil desires, etc., is nonsense." If such is the case, it is interesting to inquire what estimate we may reasonably make as to the number of wills on earth really free. It may also be allowable to ask, whether freedom of the will is possible without adequate knowledge and experience, an intelligent comprehension of the relations between causes and effects, and the faculty of discerning the real value of things.

To my mind, the wondrous spectacle of infinite diversities in the influence of corporeal elements over spiritual essences does not suggest judicial purposes, but educational purposes. In connection with this, I submit that in our interpretations of Scriptural statements we ought to consult the volumes of Nature and Providence. I think individualism is developed and established by the marvellous varieties in human consciousness, and a sense of conflicting impulses forms and strengthens the faculty of choice. In this life we derive our knowledge chiefly through the influence of contrasts, and without the permission of evil, our emotions could only have been exercised in one direction. If everything around us was soothing and cheering, and if kindly looks, tones, and deeds alone were within the limits of our cognisance, what intelligent consciousness and conception could we have had, of hope and trust—courage—constancy—self-control—endurance—self-sacrifice?

I venture to submit the following process of reasoning in connection with the Larger Hope. There are declarations in the sacred volume, which appear to me absolute and fundamental, controlling all others. We have the grand proclamation, "God is light," "God is love." If it is right and proper to say that all legislation for India must be in harmony with the proclamation made by the Empress of India, when she assumed that august title, I contend that we may and ought to understand the Divine legislative and administrative measures on the same principles.

We have the purposes clearly declared, "to reconcile all things unto Himself" (Col. i. 20); "to gather together in one all things in Christ" (Eph. i. 10). I am entitled to believe that all penalties and inflictions, however painful and protracted, are not only for punishment and retribution, but also for the furtherance of those great purposes. The grand transforming influences are light and love, the gradual dissipation of dense mists of ignorance and misconception, the gradual perception and joyous recognition of the Divine tenderness.

I derive a lucid revelation of the beneficent designs of God from the wonderful effects produced by the circulation of the Bible during the last three hundred years. We see them in the modified attitude and professed aims of earthly governments, the softening of the criminal code, the extinction of slavery, the repression of many ferocious practices, and the enlarged notions of obligations and duties in connection with human sorrows and miseries. The benignant maxims and precepts of the New Testament have rendered the idea of tortures and burning alive, as earthly punishments, quite intolerable to us. We do not admit the word "irretrievable," as entitling us to turn away from any cases of suffering, misery, and crime. Yet Thomas Erskine said, "Many things appear and are irretrievable to us, but there is nothing irretrievable with God."

J. B.

Surbiton, May 10th, 1886.

## SOUL AND CONSCIENCE.

SIR,—Whether your readers agree with your remarks on Mr. Mercer Davies' little work—not little in its subject or his handling of it—the importance of such studies, in a sanitary and spiritual point of view, ought undoubtedly to engage the attention and interest of the clergy, as you justly tell us. Most readers of the Bible do not regard it as intended to teach physical or astronomical science, but readers of the Bible must accept, as your leading article does, the definite statement, "the life is in the blood." Arguing from this, we can see that Mr. Davies may with advantage reconsider his position as to conscience residing in the brain. He may go "further back," as you suggest, and connect it with the blood, or in some way with the heart, as the Bible does. If he held still that "the brain was the seat of conscience," we may be allowed to doubt it, when intelligence and moral conscience can be proved to be present, although some of a man's brains have been knocked out. This is literally the case. A lad was working on a scaffold; he tumbled from it, and was brought up by scaffolding below; in the fall he struck his head against a projection, and lost some of his brains, besides sustaining many other fractures. Our doctor did his best, but the case was one for the Gloucester Infirmary. He remained for a long time unconscious; *mirabile dictu*, he got perfectly well! He obtained a clerkship in an office, married, has a family, and has conducted himself so well that his pay has been raised. He is far from wanting in intelligence, and his moral conduct has been exemplary. If any of his conscience left with the brains he lost, I must think his conscience was very generally diffused and largely circulated in his brain, to allow of the loss of some uncomfortably, and the retention of so much comfortably.

The Rev. J. B. Heard, in his "Trepartite Nature of Man," seems to me nearer the mark than Mr. Davies, when he thinks the brain has evolved the soul and a moral conscience. I need not do more than allude to Mr. Heard's work, for its increasing sale (judging by new editions) speaks in favour of his deep study of the question of body, soul, and spirit being appreciated.

A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, Gloucestershire, May 11th, 1886.

## BURIAL REFORM.

SIR,—In calling attention to the advertisement in your columns, announcing the eighth annual meeting of the Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, to be held under the presidency of the Duke of Westminster, in Grosvenor House, kindly permit me to point out that there is manifest ground for congratulation in the fact that this movement has been initiated by the Church. It now only remains for the officers of the Church, who have a unique position of influence and authority in every parish in the land, to set to work in earnest to remove the abuses which have gathered round the prevalent mode of burying the dead.

J. ERSKINE CLARKE,
Vicar of Battersea,
One of the Council of the Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association.

May 12th, 1886.

## "HOLD FAST THE FORM OF SOUND WORDS."

SIR,—I will take it for granted that St. Paul here speaks of the value of a sound form of words. I am led to speak on this subject by two utterances, which I see this week in a contemporary. One is a direction to an enquiring "Priest," as to what he is to do with what remains of the consecrated wine after a private celebration: "Take a stoppered bottle to bring away the *species*."

1. Species is a Roman term. It means the appearance, but not the reality. But this is contrary to the Prayer Book, which calls the elements, after consecration, "these Thy creatures of bread and wine."

2. If creatures, how are they to be worshipped, our Lord's body being locally in heaven, and nowhere else?

3. The Rubric says the elements are not to be taken away, but consumed on the spot. This must apply as much to a sick-room as the church; the evils, if any, must be equal in both cases.

4. The second matter I would notice, in this number of your contemporary, is what Mr. Ponsonby says in his sermon, p. 323: "The bread and wine remain in *their outward existence* the same to the sight, the touch, the smell, and so on; but are, by the operation of Christ's continued blessing, through the ministry of His Church, made His Body and Blood." This is pure Popery and Transubstantiation. The bread and wine retain their inward, as well as "their outward existence," so that there is no other substance locally present to be worshipped or adored.

5. In that sense the bread and wine are our Lord's

Body and Blood. Bishop Andrewes, a great authority with this paper, p. 321, states : "It is His *cadaver*, His dead body, which is not now in existence at all. His body broken, His blood spilt, and separated from His body. In whatever sense the bread and wine, which our Lord, *still alive*, called His body slain, and His blood spilt, in that sense alone are they so now.

6. It is very easy to call the mystery "ineffable" but we are not to believe we know not what—At any rate Rome has explained it, and we are not to be told that her theory is the correct one. When I asked a young clergyman of this school what he believed, he as much as said he did not know. This is a strange confession for a teacher—especially for one who would put forward such statements as those of Mr. Ponsonby.

7. Mr. Ponsonby will say that the change is produced by the words "This is My body." But then the words should be, "This shall be My body" To assert a change already past, and to say that the change is produced by the assertion, is a contradiction and downright nonsense.

8. Let us keep to our old Divines. Let us say with Andrewes, that it is not a living body, but a cadaver. Let us say, with Bull, Cosen, Jackson, Sutton, and a host of others, that His body and blood mean that a grace from His body comes to us from Heaven, and that therefore the bread and wine, remaining in this substance, are so designated.

C. C. V. G.

P.S.—I would write to the contemporary itself, but they will not admit any controversy on the matter—*pro ratione sit voluntas !*

THE *World* states that Canon Liddon is in much better health, but that such favourable reports do not reach the friends of Canon Scott Holland, who suffers terribly from sleepless nights.

BURIAL REFORM.—Last month a Conference was held in Dublin to consider the propriety of establishing a Church of Ireland Burial Reform Association. The Archbishop of Dublin, who presided, said that if death was regarded by them as a spectre, it was time they should go up to the spectre and find that it was nothing more than a spectre after all. Rev. C. T. M'Cready Hon. Sec., *pro. tem.*, read a statement signed by the Lord Lieutenant, and letters from the Bishops of Limerick, Killaloe, and Meath, in approval of the proposed movement, the last named writing that it appeared to him little short of moral guiltiness to continue the costly and mischievous system of burial in coffins of metal, &c. Rev. F. Lawrence, Hon. Sec. Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, said that the Church had it in her power to confer a great boon on the community at large, if she set to work in earnest to bring back the mode of burial unmistakably indicated in the burial service, namely, burial in the simplest possible coffin, in the plain earth, with only such accessories as would be suggested by the Christian principles of Faith, Hope and Love. After discussion, it was resolved and carried unanimously, that it was desirable to form a Church of Ireland Funeral Reform Association, the Lord Lieutenant being patron, and the Archbishop president. A similar conference was held on Friday in the Chapter House, Bangor, the Bishop of Bangor presiding, when it was resolved unanimously, upon the proposition of the Dean of Bangor, seconded by the Hon. Colonel Sackville West, to form a branch of the association for the Diocese of Bangor. It was stated that the Lord Bishop of Ely had promised to introduce the subject of burial Reform to the notice of the Upper House of Convocation, and the Right Hon. A. J. Beresford-Hope to that of the House of Laymen ; and that a conference would be held at Cambridge, under the presidency of the Bishop of Ely, for the purpose of forming a branch for the Diocese of Ely.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Audland, Rev. John Heslop, M.A., Vicar of Dinton.
Bartlett, Rev. Henry James, Perpetual Curate of Halvetown.
Bousfield, Rev. Christopher Harker, M.A.. Vicar of St. John's, Kinson.
Bradford, Rev. L. H., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Peter's, Eaton Square ; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Upper Clapton.
Clemens, Rev. A. R., Chaplain and Head Master of the London Orphan Asylum, Watford ; Vicar of St. Bartholowmew's Bethnal-green.
Crabbe, Rev. H. A., Incumbent of Inchbrook by Nailsworth.
Du Prè Rev. Samuel, Rector of Wormington.
Every, Rev. Edward, Rector of Calstock.
Greig, Rev. David, M.A., Rector of Addington, Bucks ; Rector of Cottenham, near Cambridge.
Guy, Rev. F. B., D.D., formerly Crewe Exhibitioner of Lincoln College, and Head Master of the Forest School, Walthamstow ; Rector of Great Leighs, Essex.
Handley. Rev, Edward, M.A., Rector of Winthorpe, Notts.
Ingles, Rev. D., Vicar of St. Andrews, Halstead ; Vicar of Witham.
Mackey, Rev. Donald John, M.A., Vicar of Cleeton, St. Mary ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Hereford.
Maclean, Rev. Joseph Henry., Rector of Chilcombe.
Macnaught, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of St. Bartholomew's, Covenham.
Meigh. Rev. Josiah, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Peter's, Portland.
Morris, Rev. Theodore Hastings, A.K.C., Curate of Leamington Priors ; Vicar of Morton Morrell.
Mountfield, Rev. D., Rector of Loftus, near Saltburn, Yorks.
Napier, Rev. John Russell, B.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Preston.
Peeke, Rev. John Dawson, M.A., Rector of Week St. Mary, Cornwall.
Potter, Rev. Beresford, M.A., Rector of St. Peter's, March ; Vicar of Wellesbourne, Warwickshire.
Reeves, Rev. John Fry, Curate-in-Charge of Tregony-with-Cuby, Cornwall.
Wheeler, Rev. Horace Newman, M.A., Vicar of St. Michael's, Caerhays, Cornwall ; Vicar of Hessenford, St. Germans.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Ffennell, Rev. William J., (Chaplain), at Mahablishwar, after a short illness, on the 11th inst.

Goodman, Rev. Godfrey, D.D., Rector of Fairsted, Witham, Essex, and formerly Head Master of the Bishop's Stortford High School, on the 9th inst., at the Rectory, Fairsted, Witham, Essex, aged 63.

Hewitt, Rev. Thomas Swinton, for twenty-eight years Vicar of Leysters, on the 6th inst., at Leysters Vicarage, aged 69.

Horton, Rev. George William, M.A., Vicar of Wellow, on the 6th inst, at 17, Belmont, Bath, aged 55.

Hughes, Rev. Annesley Paul, M.A., Rector of Bucknall Horncastle, Lincolnshire, on the 1st inst.

Norris, Rev. Philip, for nine years rector of Buckland, on the 3rd inst., at Buckland Rectory, aged 48.

Pering, Rev. Peter, M.A., for many years Vicar of Great Cornard, on the 1st inst. at 46, Brompton-crescent, aged 87.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## MOSES SMITES THE ROCK.

By the Rev. J. E. KEMPE, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of St. James, Westminster.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday Morning, May 9th, 1886.

"And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice: and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank, and their beasts also. And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron, Because ye believed Me not, to sanctify Me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them."—Numbers xx., 11. 12.

THE rock, in which we have St. Paul's authority for seeing a type of Christ, was that which, by God's express command, Moses smote in Horeb, when the people, encamping at Rephidim, murmured for water; as we have heard to-day that they did again at Kadesh. What St. Paul says, is that the rock so smitten in Horeb "followed" the Israelites in their wanderings, and he intimates that it was the constant source of their supply during the whole number of years which intervened between that, the first, and this, the third and last, stage of those wanderings. Wherever they halted, the rocky ground beneath their feet, or the rocky masses which rose around or near them, sent forth in rills or gathered into wells, all that was required to quench the thirst of that multitudinous host of men, women, children, and cattle. And this was done, not by the mere operation of any natural laws, nor yet even by a supernatural guidance directing the people to spots where water that already existed there would be found; but by the creative agency of Him by Whom God made the world. His word, "if any man thirst let him come unto Me and drink," received then its physical illustration as an emblem of that spiritual sense in which it is now addressed to His Church.

But although Christ had wrought supernaturally in thus making provision for God's people, it is probable that He had done it with so little apparent departure from natural processes that gradually they had come to regard their supply as matter of course, and had lost all sense of dependence for it upon Divine assistance, and all feeling of thankfulness for that assistance. Such, at least, is the effect upon too many of us of that unvarying regularity and abundance with which a bounteous Providence furnishes us with whatever is needful for the sustenance of our bodily life. The failure of water, therefore, at Kadesh may be regarded as having been meant to remind the people once more, and now at the commencement of the last stage of their progress from Sinai to Canaan, to Whom it was that they had been indebted for their mercies in the past, and to Whose hand they must attribute the yet greater blessings which they were so soon to realise.

It cannot be necessary to repeat the whole of the story which you have heard so recently. It will be enough if I remind you how Moses and Aaron, being driven by the angry complaints of the people to intercede for them with God and to ask His guidance for themselves, receive command that Moses, having taken in his hand the rod with which he had wrought the miracles in Egypt, and which was laid up in the Tabernacle as the memorial of those interpositions, and having gathered the assembly together, they shall unite in speaking to the cliff beneath which the camp was pitched, in the presence and hearing of all the congregation. This, they are told, shall suffice to bring forth water for the people and their beasts. The tone of invitation in which they addressed the assembly before proceeding to work the miracle, the way in which they appeared to arrogate to themselves the power which belonged only to God—"must we fetch you water out of this rock?"—and Moses' departure from the instructions he had received in his smiting the rock, and that twice, instead of simply speaking to it, are incidents which do not appear to be of great importance in themselves, but which become so from the manner in which they are regarded and dealt with by God. To smite the rock, instead of being contented to speak to it only, was an act of unbelief. The blow seemed a more likely means of eliciting water than the mere word; and for what other purpose had Moses been bidden to take the rod into his hands?—the very rod with which he had smitten the rock, in obedience to God, on Horeb! Accordingly, not what God had plainly said, but what His servant, in the exercise of his own judgment, presumed that God must mean, or at any rate would allow him to do, on the impulse of his own feelings, or in order to make the miracle more impressive, this is the course he adopted, and by which he brought upon himself a punishment than which few could be felt by him to be more severe. And Aaron is included in the rebuke. To treat the offence of the people in their murmurings as if it were an offence against themselves instead of against God, and (as has been observed before) to speak of the miracle that was about to be wrought as though it were to be wrought by their own inherent power, instead of through their agency indeed, but by Him whose working alone ought to be recognised in such a case; this was to fail to "sanctify" Him "in the eyes of His people." "Therefore," such is the Divine sentence, "therefore ye,"—ye, Moses and Aaron,—"shall not bring

this congregation into the land which I have given them."

The water, however, is given, in spite of the neglect of God's servant to do as he was bidden to do for its production. Neither will God be robbed of His glory, nor shall the stream of His mercy be intercepted from His people, because the instruments He employs are imperfect and, still worse, His agents disobedient and unworthy. But I will say more upon this point presently.

Here, then, at Kadesh, as in Horeb, we may see in the smitten rock or cliff the type of Christ, and read in the incidents of the story the typical or parabolic representations of truths concerning Him, important, though in varying degrees, to be understood and applied by ourselves.

The rock once smitten, in Horeb, and not to be smitten again, though the want of its life-giving waters be felt never so sorely, may remind us of that one sacrifice for sin, once offered upon the Cross, and never to be repeated, wherein the wounded side sent forth the mingled stream of water and blood, to flow for ever for the healing and refreshing of the nations.

But though it is the case that that One offering must be regarded as having "perfected for ever them that are sanctified," there is a constantly recurring need for the application of its benefits to fainting and dying souls; and for this purpose the type of to-day teaches us that the Rock must be spoken to, not smitten. Yes! my brethren, Christ must be approached, as He sits at the right hand of God, in the character of our Intercessor with the Father, in the language of spiritual supplication:— "Son of God, we beseech Thee to hear us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, grant us Thy peace. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. O Christ, hear us. Lord, have mercy upon us. Christ, have mercy upon us. Lord, have mercy upon us." "From our enemies defend us, O Christ. Graciously look upon our afflictions. Pitifully behold the sorrows of our hearts. Mercifully forgive the sins of Thy people. Favourably, with mercy, hear our prayers. O Son of David, have mercy upon us. Both now and ever vouchsafe to hear us, O Christ. Graciously hear us, O Christ. Graciously hear us, O Lord Christ." This is the kind of speaking, in answer to which, if it be the utterance of believing and fervent hearts, we may be assured that the Holy Spirit will be given to us, and our souls revived and sustained in the most trying seasons of our pilgrimage on earth.

It would seem to be want of faith in the word so spoken to Christ, something of that impatient, mistrustful state of feeling which appears to have instigated Moses, that leads so many of our people to crave, and tempts so many of our clergy to minister to their craving, for forms of worship in which the eye is appealed to to a far greater extent than any warrant can be found for in our Book of Common Prayer. Symbolic objects and actions are laid stress upon, not, we are told, for their own sake, but for the sake of the effect they have in conveying or exhibiting truth to the mind through the visual organs. It is not enough to instruct or impress the congregation by the words which the Liturgy has provided for the Church's offices, though they may be expounded and enforced by those spoken from the pulpit; but there must also be something or rather there must be a great deal to impart the desired lessons, and awaken the desired feelings, through that medium which the heathen poet (in a passage hackneyed by quotation) represents as so much more effectual than the ears for securing interest and attention, *Segnius irritant animos demissa per aures, Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus.* No doubt there is a legitimate extent to which the eye may be enlisted in communicating sacred verities, and producing holy emotions. As Moses was bidden to take in his hand the rod with which he had smitten the rock in Horeb, in order to remind the people that what was to be done at Kadesh, was, in fact, a continuation of one and the same work, and to be ascribed to one and the same Divine agency; so when the Church applies to us anew the benefits of Christ's Body once broken and Christ's Blood once shed upon the Cross, she exhibits (as required by her Lord) in the bread and wine, the outward representatives of that Body and that Blood, in order that we may trace directly to that Cross, and not to any intermediate source or agency, the strength and the refreshment which the Holy Eucharist can convey to our souls. But the reason which the Lord may be believed to have had for forbidding the use of the rod which Moses was thus to carry (viz., lest the instrument of the Divine blessing should be unduly magnified, and come, like the brazen serpent, to be itself an object of worship) must, I think, be considered to apply to an excessive or unauthorised resort to external aids (as I may call them) for the accomplishment of spiritual purposes. There is danger that by so doing men may be led to mistake for spiritual emotions purely sensuous, and, moreover, that an idolatry of means, instruments, agencies and agents, may come at length to take the place of the spiritual worship of the invisible and only God.

Moses mistrusted the efficacy of the word, though God had bidden him employ it, for supplying the wants of His people, much as, I fear, many of us clergy are coming to do in these days, through the chilling influence which we allow flippant and contemptuous criticism upon the pulpit to exercise over us. We are in great danger of losing confidence in our commission to preach the Gospel. The sneers and jests of the newspapers, the glances of ill-mannered hearers at the watch or the clock, and the unseemly,

not to say offensive, practice of walking out of church as soon as the clergyman ascends the pulpit, may so discourage some of us as to make us doubt the sufficiency of the Word of Truth for changing the human heart; and thus tempt recourse to methods which, though good in their proper place and proportion, are surely no adequate substitutes for the simple proclamation of the message of salvation. Sermons are coming to be neglected in our Church—slurred over, hastily composed, abbreviated, and treated as altogether of secondary importance, while all care and attention are concentrated upon what is called, but too appropriately, the performance of the services. "'Speak'—no, that will not be of much use. The words will be treated as no more than our own words—the utterances of individual opinion, or the outbursts of individual feeling. Anyone and everyone will hold himself at liberty to despise them. No, we will not speak—we will act. With all reverence and pains we will come before the people as the *personæ Ecclesiæ* (*persona* —parson—means an actor's mask, a thing to hide the actor's self from view) uttering only the Church's words, obeying only the Church's instructions; and this we will do in such wise as to make everyone feel that it is the Church, and not we, who are the teachers of the people." Such notions and resolutions, plausible as they sound, are mistaken in us, and there is a fault in the laity, who encourage or provoke them. Your feeling, as ours, should be that, "all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass," that while "the grass withereth, and the flower thereof fadeth away, the Word of the Lord endureth for ever; and this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." The congregations must have the water of life, or they will perish; and this water must flow to them, if it is to flow according to God's will and appointment, not through the performance of ceremonies such as was the smiting with the rod, but by the utterance of words—the words of living lips opening the abounding treasures of Christ's grace to His thirsting people.

But it may be said "The water did come out—it came out abundantly, and the congregation drank, and their beasts also—notwithstanding the faithless action by which it was called forth." True, and these are some of the inferences which we may draw from it.

1. God, in His wisdom and mercy, would not visit, even upon a rebellious people the offence which was that of their leaders only. The familiar quotation, *delirant reges plectuntur Achivi*, applicable in so many cases, was not altogether so in this. The faith of the rulers failed, but the congregation, to all outward appearance, did not suffer for it. I say, "to all outward appearance," for, although they received the bodily relief, it is probable that, if Moses had done as God would have him do, the spiritual effect of the miracle upon those who witnessed it would have been far greater. They would never have spoken against God, and said, "He smote the stony rock, indeed, that the water gushed out, and the streams flowed withal: but can He give bread also, and provide flesh for His people?"

2. Again, as it is an axiom in morals that the end will not justify the means, so it may be held that in spiritual things effects will not always avouch and approve methods; results are no sure tests of the goodness of processes. Few things have done and are doing more mischief in the Church of Christ, than the readiness with which the appeal to what is called success is apt to be welcomed. There is hardly any movement for the furtherance of the Gospel so irregular, so irrational, so extravagant, so heterodox, so unscriptural, that it cannot, by pointing to its indisputable successes, win the approval and support of persons, well-meaning and pious enough, but incapable of striking a just balance of spiritual profit and loss, unable to trace the great preponderance of evil which should be set against the good so superficially estimated and welcomed. God forbid that we should dispute or doubt that spiritual blessings have been and are derived from modes of worship, presentations of doctrine, stimulants of emotion, and other courses quite indefensible upon any other ground than that of their seemingly good effects. If Moses accomplished his immediate purpose (yes, and God's purpose too), by an action which God did not approve, we may be sure that had he had recourse to one which God did approve, he would have been equally, if not more successful—would have achieved some better and greater end than the quenching of the bodily thirst of the congregation, and the watering of their panting beasts. Seeking first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, he would have won that, with the incidental addition of the bodily relief. We are too apt in almost all things, and especially in holy things, so to look at the things which are seen and temporal as to obstruct our spiritual vision, and prevent it from duly realising those which are unseen and eternal.

## MIRACLES AND THE LAW OF NATURE.

By Rev. Professor BONNEY, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.

Sermon Preached in Quebec Chapel, London, on Sunday April 4.

"Jesus said unto him, Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will in no wise believe."—St. John, iv. 48.

IT is evident from the tenor of this and many other passages in the New Testament, that, if we may trust the authors, there was a remarkable difference in one respect at least between the first and the nineteenth century of our era. The men of the former expected that the herald of a

new dispensation would exhibit certain credentials, which with the present generation apparently would excite suspicion rather than carry conviction. At an early stage of the world's history, as in the childhood of the individual, the idea of general law is subordinated to that of personal government; hence a story with a miraculous element finds ready hearers and easy credence. Not so at a later stage, when the idea of all-pervading law begins to be realised; when the vastness of the universe, the littleness of the individual, is appreciated. Thus the miraculous element in the history of Jesus Christ, which at one time would have even commended it to hearers, has at the present become, to the minds of many a difficulty in the way of its acceptance. This is indeed no new thing. It is part of the price which we must be content to pay for being delivered from the yoke of sacerdotal authority. There is a certain truth in the taunt that the Protestant is the father of the Rationalist; but on that point we need not greatly disquiet ourselves, because it is only another way of saying that a free man runs some risks which a slave does not incur. The state of feeling on the subject of the miraculous element in Christianity—a state of such doubt and hesitation, that it would be a relief to many earnest-minded men to learn that the former could be separated from the latter—is to a certain extent a result of the vast increase of knowledge, especially in regard to the order of nature, which has been one of the distinctive characteristics of the present and part of the last century. It is also to some extent a penalty which must be paid by sincere Christians, for the blind opposition which was formerly offered by their representatives to the growth of science. Those, who like myself, are old enough to remember the silly nonsense and ignorant denunciation with which certain discoveries and hypotheses in geology and biology were once greeted, cannot feel surprised that the clergy as a body are regarded with some contempt by many scientific men, or that they have succeeded in awakening a general mistrust as to the credibility of their message.

I purpose then, this afternoon, to offer some remarks upon the miraculous element in Christianity, in the hope of showing that it neither can be nor ought to be eliminated. I assume myself to be addressing those who are at least Theists; to argue against Atheism would be a waste of time, as any one holding that opinion is not likely to be here.

In the first place, let us come to a fairly clear understanding of what we mean by the complex term miracle. If I mistake not, it embodies, as in a symbol, two ideas. The one, that an occurrence is without any adequate antecedent cause, and is thus often contrary to an expectation which is grounded on previous observations; the other, that this occurrence is opportune, happening at a crisis in the history of a man or a nation, and directly or indirectly connected with that asserted transference from the sphere of the unknowable into the world of sense, which commonly is called revelation. The second is inseparable from the first, for that alone would include many phenomena which are afterwards discovered to be the results of adequate but hitherto unknown causes. Indeed, it is more important than the first, because a connection with things spiritual is the essence of a miracle. The New Testament writers, at any rate, conceived the possibility of occurrences which would come under the former category being the results of forces distinctly evil, so that the message itself was always to be regarded as forming a part of the credentials of the messenger.

Now we may frankly admit at the outset, that many alleged miracles are not worthy of credence. In not a few cases the marvels of the story have been amplified by transmission, and the event which has now become a part of history never happened; in others the witnesses were deceived by impostors; in others they deceived themselves. We ought to make a very large allowance for human frailty, human credulity, and human deceitfulness; still, as has often been remarked, the production of a counterfeit is evidence for the existence of an original. The abuse, so to say, of the miraculous, is no argument against its use. If it were, we should have to abandon our belief in a Supreme Being, because men have wrought so much evil in His name.

In the case then of any alleged miracle, we are bound to use our best endeavours to obtain answers to these three questions. First: Is the narrative accurate? Second: Is the result likely to have been produced by causes which, though at the present time unknown, may hereafter be discovered? Third: What (to use a short phrase) is the doctrinal significance of the event? Tried by these tests, the majority of alleged miracles are discredited. The first is fatal to many: they cannot endure the criticism of the historian. The second disposes of many more, as being only scientific novelties or pieces of clever conjuring. The third sweeps away a crowd of ecclesiastical miracles, by exposing their antecedent incredibility. If true, they would have been wrought either in mere wantonness, as a child would delight in showing off some clever trick which he had mastered, or in support of principles and practices which are opposed to the conceptions which we have formed of righteousness and morality.

For my present purpose I abstain from asserting that every miracle recorded in the Bible would stand all these tests, nor do I maintain such a view of inspiration as would place every part of that book beyond criticism. But I do not hesitate to say that unless you start with the assumption that no amount of evidence can make a miracle

credible, and so consider the life of Christ as a framework of history buried beneath a superstructure of myth, you cannot wholly disengage it from a miraculous element.

This is a point on which I believe we shall do well to have our minds perfectly clear, for I notice that at the present time a good deal of confusion in regard to it seems to exist in the minds of many persons. They appear not to realise how inseparable Christianity (as it is ordinarily believed) is from a certain element of miracle. Of this it will be enough to mention three instances.

If, as the majority of Christians believe, Christ was born of a virgin mother, that was a miracle. If, as at least many believe, He really died and rose again, that was a miracle. Some, however, who would call themselves Christians would shrink from giving very definite expression to their belief on these two points, so I will advance a step farther, and assert that if God spoke to Jesus Christ at all in a way wholly different from that in which He speaks to other men, that was a miracle.

Reject all miracles, and you must, in rejecting this last, repudiate all that is distinctive in Christianity. It is easy to use vague phrases about divine influence and leading, but what do they mean? Either miracle or nothing at all.

Suppose, however, that we take the position now assumed by many persons, and allege that not only is a miracle incredible as being contrary to the laws of nature, but also that the idea of miracle, since we believe the laws of nature to be divinely ordained, is derogatory to the perfection of God. A part of this objection is a very old one; it involves a fallacy which has often been indicated, but on which I must briefly touch.

The phrase, "law of nature," is a verbal symbol which often is very misleading. It only means an induction from observations. These, from the nature of the case, are imperfect: hence a generalisation founded upon them is liable to be incomplete. It may express a truth, but not the whole truth. It is a summary of experience, necessarily limited, obtained by the exercise of faculties necessarily imperfect. Thus there is always a possibility of some facts being overlooked. These, though in the language of mathematicians they are small quantities of the second or third order, and so, as a rule, do not affect the general truth of our induction, may, under certain circumstances, produce an appreciable result, and their effect, if coincident, may bring about an apparent deviation from the law. We may be justified in speaking of things as improbable, but there are not many of which it would be safe to use the word impossible.

Still, it may be objected, that it is inherent in the idea of law that the same causes should always produce the same consequences. This, however, obviously begs the whole question. The antecedent causes may *appear* to be the same, but it by no means follows that they *are* the same. Cases are by no means rare in nature, as known from scientific investigation, where, under circumstances apparently similar, the same result does not follow. A familiar instance may be quoted from the science of mineralogy. As a rule, the crystalline form and the physical properties of a mineral are inseparable from its chemical composition; yet, sometimes, the same chemical substance appears in more than one crystalline form, and with diverse physical properties. Thus pure carbon is often found crystallised as graphite—soft, opaque, black; occasionally as the diamond—hard, pellucid, colourless. Each appears to be a result of the same general conditions, but we satisfy ourselves by saying that the difference must be due to a difference of environment. If, indeed, the diamond has been artificially produced—and this many still deny—we can form some notion of the nature of the difference, but we are no nearer to understanding the reason why it brings about so singular a result. Is there then anything so very improbable in the idea that miracles may be the diamonds in the higher natural history of the world?

But I will go farther and assert that there are certain occasions when we seem compelled to admit into the order of nature the idea of a miracle, namely the action of a previously unknown force or power, which has produced results, of which there could be no antecedent anticipation.

As regards the visible universe, unless we suppose it wholly subjective, we must either assume that matter is eternal or that it had a beginning. If it had a beginning, what was that but a miracle. If it is eternal, then we must assume, as its energy is dissipating, that it remained until a certain finite epoch in a condition of unstable equilibrium, after which it began to work, and in so doing to dissipate its energy. If then it was like a clock wound up, waiting for the shake which starts it into action, Who or what shook it? Surely this was a miracle?

Again, the first introduction of that mystery which we call life, into a world previously inorganic, cannot be regarded as anything but a miracle. Even supposing that we go so far as to admit a unity of origin for plants and animals, and conceive that all the varied and highly differentiated organic structures with which this world teems, have been developed from a primeval germ; yet these potentialities of reproduction and development imply the incoming of a force different from all the physical forces, and compell us to go beyond the *cosmos*, as known to us, for its origin. If for a moment we could conceive of a crystal in the Azoic world as endowed with a power of mental as well as physical reflection, what a miracle would the most ordinary vital phenomena appear to it.

But I may take a further step. Very many of those who now demur to the admission into the Christian creed of any element of miracle, fully

believe that to man—or at any rate to some men—there has been given something which makes him a child of God and an heir of immortality. As they would admit this to be a special gift to man, and not a property of life, held in common with the brute creation, such persons, it seems to me, having accepted this obvious miracle, cannot raise any *à priori* difficulties about the admission of miracles into the Christian system.

But some urge that the idea of miracle is derogatory to the perfection of God. They admit that we must look to a divine Power as author and ordainer, but consider that this function once exercised, the fact of His perfection precludes us from regarding Him as an intervener. I willingly admit that the popular idea of a miracle, as a mere thaumaturgic display, or as a sort of afterthought, may be justly so stigmatised. The rash and familiar language in which not a few earnest Christians have indulged, really does represent the Creator and Governor of the world in an aspect scarcely more dignified than that of a head engineer who has to be constantly handling and tinkering up his machine. But what if the miracle be just as much the result of law as the order of nature, both having the same source, and differing only in that the one is much more common than the other? The disturbance here is really introduced by our own imperfect conceptions. We have fallen into a habit of contrasting law and miracle, but the contrast is subjective, existing only in our minds, not objective. Law really rules in either case; in the one ordinary; in the other epochal.

A miraculous event has often been compared to the striking of a clock, but as some may object that, even if we make the hours very long, the illustration is too simple; I will add two others taken from the life of a plant, In some shrubs and trees the bark may remain externally smooth for many years, then a bud forms: it protrudes from the stem; it puts forth ultimately leaves and branches and flowers. Or again, there are some plants which but rarely flower—one is popularly asserted to bloom only once in a century. Either of these changes, when witnessed by a society of observant aphides, which had ascertained the ordinary law of development of the plant in which their brief lives were passed, would be so contrary to experience as to be miraculous, for it might not even be chronicled in the annals of their scientific societies; yet, to us, whose observations extend over a much longer time and larger area, the occurrences are quite normal. Perhaps, when the human race insists upon trying everything by the standard of its experience, making no allowance for wider possibilities, beings of a higher order may sometimes be moved to sad smiles at the presumption of the little creatures!

Let us then suppose that it was a part of the Divine plan to raise mankind from the condition of the beasts that perish to one "a little lower than the angels"; from an heritage of corruption to an heritage of incorruption. Let us suppose that He had it in view from the first to work this miracle, namely, to impart of His Spirit to an animal body, when and how is immaterial for our present purpose; then, it seems to me, there is no antecedent incredibility in supposing there might be an epoch when exceptional laws acted in immediate connection with an event so stupendous. If you do not deny the existence of a living spirit in man—his distinctive heritage—then I cannot see upon what principle you admit of a miracle in the creation of matter, and of a miracle in the creation of living beings, and refuse to allow it to be a part of the process in the creation of immortal souls.

I have been using the term miracle, but you must remember that I do not admit it to mean anything more than the operation of a law, but not of the law with which we are familiar. As a rough illustration, depict mentally the laws of the knowable as operating on the surface of a sphere, and those of the extra-knowable as operating on some other concentric surface. These two surfaces may have points of contact or lines of section, and at these a new set of laws would come into play on the former one.

But it is sometimes urged by men who cannot be called unbelievers in God, that the miraculous should be restricted to the moral order, and that the teacher divinely commissioned needs no other credentials than the appeal which his doctrine makes to the hearts of men. Perhaps it should be so, but I doubt whether history encourages us to infer that it is likely to be so. We have within us no infallible criterion to which appeal can be made. It is a matter of common experience that the best and wisest of men may err. Moreover, in matters so weighty, such men are among the most ready to hesitate in accepting novelties, and every religious reformer has to encounter in the conservatism of the well-disposed an obstacle really more formidable than the hostility of the wicked. Speaking for myself, I cannot understand how such a dispensation as that of Moses, which, rightly or wrongly, was believed by every Jew to be of divine ordaining, could have been superseded, unless the messenger of the new dispensation had been able to exhibit credentials to prove that he was more than man. In each dispensation the need, if I may use the phrase, of miracles diminishes, their didactic force is weakened, as time goes on, and simultaneously with this the appeal can be made with increasing force to the conscience and moral sense of man. All beginnings that are not merely cyclic, are of the nature of miracle, and that the greatest of all beginnings (for the spiritual is of a higher order than the natural) should be associated with a certain efflor-

escence of miracles, seems more probable than improbable.

I admit that in accordance with the canons which I have laid down, there are miracles ascribed to Christ and His immediate followers which may fairly be left as open questions—they may be accretions to history, or events which may ultimately be explained by known, or yet to be discovered laws. But strip away from Christianity with unflinching hand every element of miracle other than that of the action of the Spirit of God on the heart of man, and what do you leave? The story of a great philanthropist and moralist, whose life was a noble example of self-denial and self-sacrifice for the good of others, and who at last was cruelly murdered to show how little there was in this world to encourage any one to frame and act up to a high conception of duty. As Christ never rose from the dead—that being only a fond illusion—there is really nothing to assure you that there is any life at all after the death of the body. The analogy of nature holds out little, if any, more hope of immortality to you than it does to the insect which you crush beneath your foot. The Apostle Paul spoke—as was his wont—as an acute reasoner when he said, in effect, if Christ be not raised we are of all men most pitiable. If, notwithstanding all discouragement, you who cannot believe in the divinity of Christ Jesus—for that is what the non-belief in miracles really means—still insist on hoping for another life and immortal happiness, I may admire, indeed, your sanguine disposition, but cannot think much of your consistency as reasoners; for you reject that for which there is some evidence, and yet believe that for which there is practically none: you abandon a creed which is consistent in itself, for one which is only grounded on your own wishes and a vague belief in the goodness of God. Think, I pray you, on these things, and you will see that the issue is more momentous than, at the present day, not a few people suppose. Our choice is between Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of Man, on the one side, and, on the other, a vague possibility, a probable nothingness.

---

HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN, FOR JUNE, 1886.—SELECTED BY THE REV. JOHN NAPLETON.—6th, Sunday after Ascension. Morning: 147 + 306, 74, 145. Evening: 147 + 149, 301, 148 (2).—13th, Whit Sunday. Morning: 153 + 157, 209, 208. Evening: 155 + 347, 207, 211.—20th, Trinity Sunday. Morning: 160 + 158, 164, 271. Evening: 160 + 162, 159, 163.—27th, First Sunday after Trinity. Morning: 239, 201, 278. Evening: 106, 167, 26.

THE Rev. Edwin Hatch, Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, has been appointed Hibbert Lecturer for 1887. Mr. Hatch, who is a D.D. of the University of Edinburgh, was Bampton Lecturer at Oxford in 1880, when he chose as his subject "The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches." He is rector of Purleigh.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 22, 1886.

## QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

A GREAT deal has been said and written during the last three or four months on the subject of Church Reform, and it is very evident that some reforms are urgently needed, although it is perfectly true, as the Bishop of Norwich so wisely said at the meeting of his Diocesan Conference the other day, that "Church Reform is anything but a subject upon which experiments may be made." Certain it is that rash measures will be worse than useless; what is wanted to be done is to clear away the abuses which exist, and yet at the same time not to impair, but rather to strengthen the working powers of the Church. And one of the subjects which needs looking into is the management and the administration of the funds known as Queen Anne's Bounty.

In its original purpose it was intended to be a benefit and boon to the Church at large, and doubtless in many cases it does confer great benefit, especially to livings of small value, the annual sums received from the bounty are very acceptable at the present time, for there is no class of men who feel more keenly the effect of agricultural depression than the rural clergy; and if Mr. Gladstone would but devote some portion of his great abilities to this most pressing of all questions, he would be doing more good to the country at large, and at the same time proving his devotion to the Church, than by laying plans for the anarchy and the dismemberment of the Empire.

But besides administering the funds for the parochial clergy derived from the first-fruits and tenths, the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty are also the almoners of the money which has to be paid for the dilapidations of livings, and are also—to use a non-ecclesiastical term—money-lenders on a very large scale indeed. In many places vicarage houses have been built out of money borrowed from the Bounty, the terms of repayment being spread over a period of some thirty-one years. At the first sight it seems only right and laudable that houses of residence should be provided for the clergy, because there is nothing that is more likely to be productive of guidance,

good-will and fellowship to parishioners, than to have the clergy living among them, and we have seen quite enough of the evils of non-residence in the days that are past; but the rate of interest charged is somewhat high, viz., three and a half or four per cent. on what is the very best security. The hardship which is felt is, that in many cases money was borrowed years ago, when glebe lands were let for a fair sum, and when tithe rent-charge was at par, and sometimes above par, then the repayment of the interest was not felt as a burden; but at the present time, with diminishing tithe rent-charge at about seven and eight per cent. *below* the average, the instalments and the interest money are still kept up to the fixed sum, and no abatement is made; and in the face of all the pressing difficulties which beset the rural clergy it is rigorously exacted, the penalty being that if the money is not paid they have the power to sequestrate the benefice in order to secure payment.

We are glad to see that the Duke of Buckingham has introduced, and passed through two of its stages, in the House of Lords an Incumbents of Benefices Loans Extension Bill, which will enable the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty to extend the term for the repayment of Loans for any period not exceeding twenty years, to be accompanied by a corresponding reduction of the amount of the annual instalments of principal and interest.

Close allied to this matter, there is another question which is of great importance, and that is what may be called "the overhousing of the clergy." There is a difference between the building of a vicarage or rectory house where there is none, and no suitable house that can be rented, and the enlargement of existing houses to suit the wills and whims of some incumbents, who may be possessed of large private means, or have a large family. In such cases where the house is sufficiently large for any ordinary family, we maintain that a vicar or rector has no right to enlarge it, and lay the burden upon his successors, to pay off instalments of the money which has been borrowed. If they wish to enlarge the houses for their own convenience, it should be at their own cost.

We know of several cases where rectory houses have been enlarged with money borrowed from this fund. In one case—the living, a fairly good one as things go—the rector, a man of good private means, enlarges the house, and the result is, that no man, unless possessed of large private means, can afford to take the living, because if a poor man wishes to take it, he cannot do so, because the cost of keeping up such an establishment would impose a heavy burden, so much so, that it would become a veritable "white elephant" to him. And in another case we know of a beautifully situated rectory, with good income, but because a former vicar had private pupils, he enlarged it at considerable cost, and the result is, that a good house is spoiled and made uncomfortable, and the successors have to pay for it.

It will be said that these are exceptional cases, but we know of numerous cases, where so-called livings are saddled with heavy burdens of this kind. What is required is more adequate supervision in the matter. It is sometimes stated that it is well to have a good and commodious house attached to a living, because if the living is a poor one, some one will take it either with private means, or in order to take pupils; but while this may be the case, yet it does not alter the fact that money is often borrowed for the enlargement and extension of houses to suit the wishes of some vicar or rector, and that the legacy is left to his successors in the shape, possibly, of an unwieldy house with the additional burden of principal and interest to pay for it.

It is much to be wished that the working of this Bounty—some question whether it is much of a bounty after all—could be simplified and made easier for the clergy in these days of trouble and depression; and if the governors will take up this matter, they will be doing something towards *practical* Church Reform.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### FREE TRADE.

SIR,—Your esteemed correspondent, Mr. Sandlands, tells your readers that I have not dealt with his facts. I have referred to all his recent letters, and can find but one fact therein, viz., that he was in a manufacturing town of Germany last year, where trade was good. His views about handicapped farmers and other things are not facts: I do not denounce them as mere fancies and theories, although I think that as views they are taken through a distorting medium.

Concerning the rest of the matter in his letter dated 8th May, a condition of freedom of production and exchange of commodities is not, so far as I can see, absolutely impossible. Whether it be so or not, it is not unapproachable; and every approach to complete freedom is good for trade. It it be foolish to occupy time in discussing this, the folly consists in discussing a matter that is as certain as that two and two make four.

"Free Trade, as it exists with us, means—We pay the taxes, the foreigner does not. This state of things is monstrous." Again: "Who should pay our Government for the privilege of selling? The foreigner comes into our market toll-free; the English farmer pays a heavy toll. This is the point." Neither the English producer nor the foreign producer pays, or should pay, anything to our Government for the privilege of selling his produce. The Englishman pays taxes to the English Government for that which the Government renders to him in return; that is, protection from marauders, native and foreign, the administration of justice, public education, etc. The foreigner pays taxes to his Government for the like

things. Considering the whole amount of property in England, and the whole amount of private incomes, the wealth of England is loaded with a less proportionate burden of taxation than the wealth of any other State that I know of. It is fair that we ourselves, and not foreigners, should bear the expenses of our own State; and it is fair that the members of each foreign commonwealth should bear the cost of its maintenance. It is not only fair, but it is not possible that it should be otherwise, unless a direct tribute should be levied; which tribute would necessitate the defence of the subject country by the superior, and might be, almost certainly would be, a bad bargain for the latter. There is nothing monstrous in this.

The trades that I spoke of as flourishing are not so contemptible as Mr. Sandlands seems to think. The extent of the shirt and collar trade, in a district near this, is more than two millions sterling per annum: these shirts and collars are worn by human beings, not by dogs. In a town not very far from this, between seven and eight thousand men and boys are employed in machine and other iron work, at wages varying from twelve shillings to three pounds a week.

The question, How does the diminished production of gold operate on prices and on trade, is not one that I could reply to in a short letter. I must refer your correspondent to the works of Messrs. Chevalier and De Laveleye, if he desires to have the best exposition of that subject, which is complicated in its details, while it is extremely clear once that the principle underlying it is apprehended.

I continue this correspondence unwillingly. It would be useless for a person to discuss Kepler's laws with another person who is ignorant of the difference between an hyperbola and an ellipse. Economic science has a very close resemblance to algebraic science.

B.

Armagh, May 17th, 1886.

## THE BLACK RUBRIC.

SIR,—This shall positively be my last word on the above subject, which seems to hold the same place in your columns that King Charles's head did in Mr. Dick's memorial. I am obliged to "Presbyter" for his second letter, which is a necessary supplement to his first. His argument though ingenious is not entirely conclusive or satisfactory. If it were, why should so many of the Anglican clergy including such men as Liddon and Littledale entirely fail to see it. "Presbyter" is welcome to his own view, and I claim the same liberty for myself. I only repeat, that no one can judge fairly of the meaning of the Black Rubric who is not aware of the substitution of the phrase "corporal presence," for "real and essential presence." The word immediately preceding is (with all due respect to "Presbyter") not *belief*, but *adoration*—indeed the subject of the Rubric is Eucharistic Adoration. I fail to see that it would be no reply to an objector to point out that I am not worshipping what he objects to, but something else; the confession of a higher object of worship might as sufficiently meet the case as the denial of any worship. Canon Crosthwaite may also believe anything on this subject which is satisfactory to himself; but I beg leave most firmly and decidedly to dissent from his proposition, that "a spiritual presence of any other kind than one of effects is *nonsense*." Controversial language of this kind is very painful, and deservedly defeats its own object. I am at present writing away from my books, otherwise I could cite from the Canons of Trent a parallel passage to "Presbyter's" quotation from the 28th Article; but enough—so far as I am concerned King Charles's head shall in future rest in peace.

ANXIOUS INQUIRER.

## SELF-DENIAL.

SIR,—I have just read over Dr. Plummer's sermon on "the Pharisee in the Temple," and feel as if I would like to cross swords with him on the subject of which he speaks so much—self-denial. Perhaps I ought to entertain rather the feeling of wishing to establish what I conceive to be views more in accordance with Scripture, and, therefore, I will now seek to give expression to a thought or two.

(1) The teaching of the parable is that the sinner should approach God in the spirit of humility, and not in that of pride. This is entirely overlooked.

(2) Self-denial is made to take its place. There is nothing whatever in the parable about self-denial.

(3) Self-denial is misunderstood. There is nothing whatever said in Scripture which leads us to suppose that self-denial (denying to self little pleasures) is a virtue.

(4) The view which the writer gives of self-denial renders all duties done from such a motive worthless. One consideration is sufficient to show this. There must be the elements of pleasure and willingness if the duty is to be acceptable to God. But these elements cannot exist with self-denial. They destroy each other.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, May 9th, 1886.

SIR,—This virtue is most useful for physical and moral training and discipline, but I doubt whether many will agree with Dr. Plummer, that it is the leading virtue of Christianity. The Highest Authority tells us that unless our righteousness exceeds that of the Pharisee (Dr. Plummer's model), we shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven. Is so eminent a scholar and theologian as Dr. Plummer justified in supporting his thesis by what he calls "Christ's own interpretation of the Seventh Commandment"? It seems doubtful whether this interpretation is correctly rendered in our English versions. Ought not γυνή in Matt. v. 27, as in verses 31 and 32, to be translated "married woman," and the passage read, "But I say unto you, that every one that looketh on a married woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart"? This rendering would show our Lord's teaching on the point to be consistent with His instructions concerning other appetites and passions. Certainly γυνή is in the majority of cases used to denote a married woman, and seems to be implied in this passage, which refers to the sin of adultery. If my construction is right, the grievous responsibility of adding to the Word of God would seem to rest on Dr. Plummer and the rest of the clergy.

MEDICUS.

May 9th, 1886.

## "EARTH TO EARTH" BURIAL.

SIR,—At the eighth annual meeting of the Church of England Funeral Reform Association, to be held at Grosvenor House, on Saturday next, at 3 o'clock, an effort will be made to strike at the root of the evils complained of. Reformers have endeavoured to lop off some unhealthy excrescences which have attached themselves to our burial customs; but it has remained for that accomplished physiologist, Mr. Seymour Haden, to point out that most of the evils, *e.g.*, delayed interment, costly coffins, costly accompaniments, arrested and prolonged decay, poisoned soil, and the like, are the direct consequences of the custom of encasing the poor remains of our departed friends in strong, durable, nay, almost imperishable material, and that there is no other effectual remedy than a return to the use of speedily perishable material, and burial in earth sufficient and suitable for the resolution of the body to its constituent elements. At the meeting, an appeal will be made to incumbents of parishes, all medical men, officers of health, and solicitors, to use their great influence in the direction of adopting simple "earth to earth" burial.

F. LAWRENCE, Hon. Sec.

Church of England Funeral Reform Association,
Westow Vicarage, York, May 17th, 1886.

## Reviews and Notices.

"THE TRINITY OF EVIL, by Canon Wilberforce. London: — Hodder and Stoughton. 1886. Pp., 130. Price, 2s. 6d.

THIS is an interesting little book, dealing with the three great evils of the day, viz., Infidelity, Impurity, and Intemperance, and although in some places we find strong untruthful language, especially when dealing with the subject of Impurity, and the support given to the *Pall Mall Gazette* with reference to the recent revelations on this subject.

From the preface we gather that these articles, with the exception of the appendix, are reprinted from a publication entitled the *Christian Commonwealth*, a publication which the Canon eulogizes as "conspicuous for its courageous advocacy of right and truth"—and a few pages further on—speaking of how the name Christian has been secularized and profaned, says :—

> It is significant, but the natives blessed by the missionary labours of Dr. Judson ever declined to speak of him as Christian: the name savoured of rum and the slave trade; but recognising in him the living embodiment of his creed, they called him "the Jesus Christ man."

It is a notable fact that, apart from rum and the slave trade, in many foreign countries the action of many professing Christians has had a very bad effect on the natives, thus proving the truth of the old saying, that the inconsistency of professing Christians is the greatest stumbling-block to Christianity.

The article on Infidelity is very good, and contains many important truths, as for instance :—

> I do not know that it would be correct to say that there is now more unbelief in proportion to the population than formerly, but it has arrived at a new development. It is more patent, more aggressive, and above all more recorded, and therefore more mischievous.

Speaking of the causes which lead to unbelief, we think that some of the statements are a little too sweeping and general in their character; he says :—

> How much, for example, is directly to be attributed to the utterly unspiritual lives of professed believers? How much to the unacting orthodoxy of rigid dogmatists, who, while adhering to the letter of Catholic tradition, will not stretch out a finger to assist in removing evils which are turning this world into a gaol, a lazar-house, a hell for millions? How much to the healthy revolt of a developing humanity against cramping sacerdotalisms, soul-withering limitations, and theological caricatures of the Divine Being? How much to the timid, grudging, persecuting attitude adopted in times past by men of religion to the researches of science?

We confess that we should have been better pleased if the author had explained some of these statements; as for instance, the "evils which are turning the world into a gaol" and the "soul-withering limitations" and "theological caricatures of the Divine Being." Surely such strong statements ought not to be made without some note of explanation. At the same time we agree with him to a certain extent, in what he says as to the action of religious men, with regard to the researches of science. "What will be the effect of a wide-spread denial of the faith?" he asks, and truly answers :—

> Upon the Church, the invisible Body of Christ, its effect must needs be stimulating and purifying; the progress of vital faith is advanced, and its pungency as salt of the earth intensified by constant questioning and sifting.

Speaking also of those who profess to long for national progress under such watchwords as Liberty, Fraternity, Equality, or who encourage or trifle with Atheism, the author says that "is politically as suicidal as morally it is discreditable"—a conclusion in which all right-minded and thinking men will most cordially agree.

The article on Impurity is very strong in its condemnation of this great evil; yet while condemning the evil, and using all right and lawful means to order and control it, we think the worthy Canon goes out of his way, and is absolutely wrong and unchristian in venting his indignation against those who brought the Editor of the *Pall Mall* to book for its spurious and manufactured revelations, and says :—

> The storm of indignation which has burst upon the *Pall Mall Gazette* on account of its recent exposure of flagitious and all-sacrificing lust, has afforded to many minds an additional proof that it is characteristic of our age of peculiar self-indulgence to deprecate plain-speaking about plain sins; to endure unblushingly the visible manifestation of evil, and prudishly hide the head when such evils are denounced from pulpit, press, or platform by their proper names.

He also speaks of not a few leaders of so-called high life living openly in adultery. Until we read this book we supposed that it was the primary office and duty of a priest to follow Christ in bearing witness to the truth. This, however, is not the learned Canon's view. He denounces in unmeasured terms the Government, the Judge, the jury, the counsel, and all concerned in the prosecution of Mr. Stead and the *Pall Mall Gazette*. In his preface he lectures "the honourable medical profession," as he styles it, for reprimanding Dr. Haywood Smith for assisting in perpetrating a wanton and cruel assault on a young and innocent girl, and a shameless and fraudulent lie on the public. He sneeringly adds, that "the profession cordially approves of certain Acts under which many thousands of (public) women have been compulsorily exposed to medical examination, with no pretence to any high or generous intention." There is no analogy whatever between the two cases,

and the Canon ought to know that the profession acts in obedience to Christ's injunction, "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers"; and that thereby they have saved many hundreds of thousands from the most degenerating and destructive of all hereditary diseases. We regret that the author has no word of condemnation for the malicious and uncharitable spirit of class-hatred in which the "revelation" of the *Pall Mall Gazette* was written. On the contrary, he seems to have approved, if not to have imitated, it; and as far as we are concerned he is welcome to Mr. Stead's reward in the cheers of working men. There is strong condemnation of the sensational three-volume novel, and he urges upon society to resolutely exclude from their houses men, whatever be their credentials of birth or wealth, who are known to be living in open sin. If this suggestion were carried out to the letter, then the work of Purity Societies would become comparatively easy.

In dealing with the subject of intemperance, he cites the words, that in the twelve foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem the twelfth was an amethyst. He says: "The word can bear but one interpretation, a combination of two familiar Greek words—*a*, not; and *methustos*, a user of strong drink. Its literal common-sense translation is, 'Abstinence from strong drink.'" We object to the use of such words as "drink, the devil in solution." Such words we sometimes hear of as being used in the heat and excitement of a platform address, when a man gets carried away with enthusiasm; but for a Canon of the Church of England to calmly write them in a book is past the comprehension of some.

There is one practical suggestion as to the means of combating this evil, and that is to have good temperance refreshment rooms, and "not a dingy fly-blown kennel of discomfort."

There is much that is good, much that is interesting, in this work. We regret the introduction of the strong and often misleading language that is to be found in its pages, but it will repay careful perusal.

---

On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday last, the Bishop of Salisbury conducted a retreat for the clergy of his diocese, at the palace.

The prominence assumed at the late election by the question of Disestablishment has given rise to a remarkable movement in Oxford, which may produce momentous results in the history of the Church. The idea occurred to some of the younger graduates, who had observed the extent to which the opposition to the Establishment is founded on ignorance, of forming an association for the diffusion of knowledge as to the history and the true position of the Church of England. The project was warmly taken up, and a very complete organisation has come into existence, and taken the name of the "Oxford Laymen's League for the Defence of the National Church." A glance at the list of names connected with the scheme is enough to show how influential a means it may become of moving public opinion. The President is Sir William Anson, the Warden of All Souls'; the Vice-President Mr. Warren, the President of Magdalen; on the various committees are to be found almost all the most able and distinguished members of the youngest generation of Oxford graduates; the co-operation of all Oxford laymen throughout the country has been invited, and many promises of powerful support have been already received. The purpose of the promoters may be given in their own words:—"In face of the menacing attitude which the advocates of that measure (disestablishment and disendowment) have assumed, it is no longer possible that adherents of the Church can with safety remain inactive. Oxford will be false to all her traditions and associations if, in such a crisis, she stands aloof. Disestablishment and disendowment vitally concern the laity as well as the clergy; laymen are pecuniarily disinterested in the solution of the question; laymen can reach classes which to the clergy are often inaccessible: laymen can employ arguments drawn from the conscious discharge of duties which no clergyman can use without loss of self-respect. . . . The essential principle of the league will be the union of the religious laity throughout the country without reference to sects and parties. Nothing can be more fatal to the Church than its connection with any one political party; its only permanent support is the party of religion. . . . Many opponents of the Church are sincere adherents of religion. It will be a special object of the league to draw these natural allies of the Church from the ranks of those who, under the insidious disguise of an attack upon the Establishment, conceal a design to destroy Christianity itself." On the subject of Church reform "every member of the league will be free to express his own opinions, provided they do not sacrifice the essentials of the Church to the maintenance of the National Establishment. The general work of the league will be to spread, by every means in its power, true views as to the position of the Church of England. . . . The chief means employed will be the delivery of lectures and the circulation of pamphlets." All present or past members of the University who wish to become members of the league, and all clergymen and others anxious to obtain help in the matter of Church Defence, are asked to communicate with the secretary, Mr. H. H. Henson, All Souls'.

---

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alcock, Rev. Henry J., Vicar of St. Mary's, West Kensington.
Billing, Rev. Robert Claudius, Rector of Spitalfields; Prebendary of Holborn in St. Paul's Cathedral.
Carr, Rev. Edgar, B.A., Vicar of Ainderby Steeple.
Dawes, Rev. Nathaniel, Vicar of St. Mary's, Charterhouse; Incumbent of St. Andrew's, Brisbane.
Ditchfield, Rev. P. H., Rector of Barkham, Wokingham, Berks.
Edwards, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Bangor.
Fitzroy, Rev. Lord Charles, Rector of Euston-cum-Barnhams, Suffolk; Honorary Chaplain to the Queen.
Greenaway, Rev. Walter Cole, M.A., Chaplain of the Royal Surrey County Hospital.
Grenside, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Vicar of Pinner.
Hind, Rev. W., M.A., late Vicar of St. Matthew's, Luton; Rector of St. Peter's, Dorchester, Dorset.
Holliday, Rev. E., Vicar of Dale Head, Clitheroe; Incumbent of the new parish of St. John's, Cloughfold, Rawtenstall.
Jones, Rev. David, Rector of Llanberis.
Kemp, Rev. H. W., Master of the Charterhouse, Hull; Canon in York Minster.
Leach, Rev. John William; Rector of Chelvey.
Lewis, Rev. Daniel Jones, M.A., Vicar of Llanidan.
Lewis, Rev. Walter Allen, B.A., Curate of the Parish Church, Wakefield; Vicar of Thornes.
Louch, Rev. Thomas, Curate of St. Stephen's, Poplar; Incumbent of Geraldton (Diocese of Perth), Western Australia.
MacLeod, Rev. Roderick C., B.A., Vicar of Bolney.
Marshall, Rev. R. T., Minor Canon of Winchester; Vicar of Longstock, near Stockbridge.

Milner, Rev. Gamaliel, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. John Evangelist, Hoylandswaine.
Minos, Rev. P. J., B.D., Chaplain of Appuldurcombe College, Isle of Wight.
Pearce, Rev. Duncan, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Sayers Commons.
Powles, Rev. Robert Fraser, Curate of Beaulieu, Hants ; Domestic Chaplain to Lord Montague.
Salt, Rev. W. J., Curate of Holy Trinity, Milton-next-Gravesend ; Vicar of St. John's, Longton, Staffordshire.
Stanton, Rev. Alfred Herbert, M.A., Curate of Radley, Abingdon ; Rector of Llangasty, Tallyllyn, Breconshire.
Taylor-Taswell, Rev. S. T., M.A., Vicar of Chilvers Coton, near Nuneaton ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Worcester.
Willson, Rev. Headley, M.A., Vicar of Cherry Hinton.
Wynch, Rev. John William. M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Cambridge.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brown, Rev. Langton Edward, B.A., for forty-one years Vicar of Dormington with Bartestree, at Dormington Vicarage, near Hereford, on the 10th inst., aged 77.

Button, Rev. Thurston, Archdeacon of Kokstad, dio. St. John's, Kaffraria, at Clydesdale, Umzimkulu, South Africa, on March 27th, aged 40 years.

Caister, William, M.A., M.L. (St. John's College, Cambridge), of 3 and 4, New Inn, younger son of W. Caister, Esq., J.P., Boston, on the 8th inst., aged 30.

Campbell, Rev. Alexander Burrowes, M.A., at 12, Calverley Park Gardens, Tunbridge Wells, on the 13th inst., aged 88.

Cassan, Rev. Algernon William, M.A., Oxon, Senior Assistant-Priest of St. Mary, Bathwick, at Bath, on the 10th inst., aged 63.

Clifford, Rev. John Bryant, at Redland, Bristol, on the 15th inst., aged 81.

Durnford, Rev. Edward, Vicar of Heathfield, at Heathfield, on the 13th inst., aged 39.

Edwards, Rev. John, at Minety Vicarage, Malmesbury, on the 17th inst., aged 59.

Jervis, Rev. William J., M.A., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Head Master of Rye Grammar School, at Rye, on the 7th inst., aged 41.

Leonard, Rev. Francis Burford, M.A., thirty-nine years Rector of Kemeys Inferior, at Llandevaud, on the 13th inst., in his 80th year.

Mayhew, Rev. W., M.A., late Rector of St. Andrew's, Half-Way-Tree, Jamaica, at Great Bealings, Woodbridge, on the 11th inst., aged 77.

Mills, Rev. Alfred Wilson, for twenty-two years Vicar of St. Erth, on the 11th inst., aged 53.

Partridge, Rev. William Edwards, at Horsenden House, Bucks, on the 13th inst., aged 77.

Tandy, Rev. John Mortimer, LL.D., at Ladysmith, Natal, on the 8th inst., aged 60.

Warren, Rev. John, Rector of Bawdrip, Somerset, at Highfield Lodge, Exmouth, on the 13th inst., aged 72.

Woollcombe, Rev. George, M.A., late Rector of Highampton, Devon, at 34, Richmond Hill, Clifton, on the 7th inst., aged 67.

Wray, Rev. William Mark, Vicar of Ovingham, at Ovingham Rectory, Prudhoe, on the 11th inst., aged 61.

## AN INTERESTING VISIT.

Extract from an article in *The Fountain.*

THE other day I had the privilege of spending an hour in the consulting-rooms of a medical electrician who bids fair to make himself a great reputation. Although Mr. B. Copson Garratt does not place himself so prominently before the public as do some others in his profession, I have good reason to believe that he is doing a work which is scarcely less extensive, and certainly is not less effective than theirs. Mr. Garratt is a man who likes to work in a quiet way. I think, however, that such a man ought to be better known. He is an enthusiast—albeit a very sober one. He will talk to you by the hour about medical electricity, in which he is, of course, thoroughly well up, and he never tires of showing you its wondrous effects. If you ask him why he goes into raptures over this remarkable therapeutic agent, he will give you two very good reasons—the first is that it gave him new life, and the second is that it has given new life to others. Mr. Garratt knows, and therefore speaks.

After giving me a little Galvanism, which had no more serious effect than to make my hands feel a little sleepy, Mr. Garratt converted the current into what is termed constant instead of induced, and assured me there was just as much Electricity passing through my body as would be sufficient in the other form to kill me. As an illustration of the penetrative power of Magnetism, I may mention that I held in front of me a mariner's compass, and Mr. Garratt held behind me one of his Magnetic bands, and in a moment the Magnetic current passed through my clothing—and I had a very heavy overcoat on—and through my body, and laid hold of the hand of the compass. This is the mighty force which Mr. Garratt infuses into and sends right through the system of his patient, producing the most astonishing and beneficial results.

Some of the most startling scientific discoveries of the present age are based upon Magnetic principles, and the efficacy of Magnetism as a healer promises to lead to results quite as startling as any that have attended it in other directions. Here let me repeat that Magnetism is not Galvanism. The latter, as I understand, often fails, and even when it succeeds it is open to the objection that its effect is too powerful. In skilful hands it has been and may be used with success ; but it is, nevertheless, in its application often of a painfully irritating character, because it must come into direct contact with the body, requiring the nerves as a conducting medium. Mr. Garratt does not claim to have made any new discovery, but he has found out how to use Electricity in the most efficient and practical way.

Magnetism does not supersede ordinary medicines, but can be used in conjunction with them without at all affecting or being affected by their action. Its chief value is that it will reach cases which ordinary medicine will not touch. Take paralysis. The doctor does not, cannot, cure paralysis ; but Mr. Garratt can point you to people who were bedridden, and, to all appearance, bedridden for life, but whom, thanks to Magnetism, have left their couch, and are now engaged in the active work of life. Long-standing cases of epilepsy and spinal irritation have also been cured. I take these cases from a pamphlet of Mr. Garratt's, where full names and addresses are given, and which will be sent post free to any person who will write to his consulting-rooms, 16, Finsbury Square, London, E.C. Ordinary medicines are of little avail in chronic cases of long standing ; but these are just the cases that Mr. Garratt likes to undertake. Another class of sufferers who derive incalculable benefit from Magnetism are people of over-worked brain. In such cases the physician usually prescribes complete rest and a total change of air, medicine being of little use. Mr. Garratt affirms that he can give the overworked man all the benefit that he would derive from rest and change, and give it to him in a very much quicker, simpler, and cheaper way. It will be seen, therefore, that Mr. Garratt's system is not opposed to the efforts of others who are battling with disease ; on the contrary, it is an auxiliary which may be used in conjunction with and as a supplement to them.

Having spent many years of patient, laborious, and continued study in adapting his treatment to some of the most obscure and intractable affections, Mr. Garratt now claims, as the result of his professional career, to have attained a success unparalleled in the healing art. Those who desire further information on his method of treatment should peruse his essays, explaining the radical effect of Magnetism upon the human organism in health and disease. It is Mr. Garratt's careful study to adapt the remedy to the requirements of each case—a practice based upon the principles laid down in his published essays, which can be obtained post free on application. He will always be able to confer with any scientific or medical gentleman, either personally or by letter, upon any phase of the subject, or any case for treatment, and will send a private list of 1,000 names, as referees, to any address.—B. COPSON GARRATT, Medical Electrician, 16, Finsbury Square, London, E.C.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## POMPS AND VANITIES.

By the Lord Bishop of PETERBOROUGH.

The substance of a Sermon Preached at Peterborough, on Sunday, March 14th, 1886.

"The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are His; and let everyone that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity."—2 Timothy ii. 19.

WE saw last Sunday that man is a member of many kingdoms, each of these kingdoms having God for its king; we saw that he is a member of the great kingdom of Nature, of which God is the Creator; we saw that he is a member of the kingdom of humanity, member of the family, member of the nation, and that of each of these God is also king. And we saw that in his baptism he enters into another, a higher, a greater, a wider kingdom—the kingdom of Christ's Church throughout the world, of which Christ the Lord is king; and that he is, therefore, a citizen of the Divine kingdom, and a member of the body of Christ, a child of God, and one who has come into his inheritance in the kingdom of Heaven. Now, in every one of these kingdoms of which man is a member there exists a covenant or an agreement between him and the king of that kingdom, just as in every earthly kingdom there is a covenant, whether expressed or understood, between the ruler and his subjects—he having something he promises to do for them, and they having something they are bound to do for him. So in every one of these kingdoms there is a covenant, an agreement, a basis, a foundation, as you have it in our text. In the kingdom of Christ, in the Divine kingdom, there is a covenant, as in the others, and every one of these kingdoms, with its covenant, has an external or visible sign of that covenant, given by God to man, in order that, seeing the sign, he may remember and understand the covenant. There is God's covenant to the world of nature—the promise of continuance and endurance; the promise of seed-time and harvest, and the promise that the waters shall no more cover the earth, and of which the sign is the rainbow, which it has been said is the world's covenant, and not the Church's. There was a covenant of the Lord with the family, and afterwards with the nation, which grew from the family, and that was the covenant of preservation—the family that was separated from all others was to be God's family and God's kingdom, and to be kept in the hollow of His hand. And on the other hand their covenant to Him was to obey His laws, and to worship and to serve Him—"Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God"—He requires you "to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God." The sign of that covenant was the sign of circumcision, which marked out His nation and family from all other things, families, and nations. And then comes into the world a new kingdom, a greater, a wider, a higher kingdom than all these other kingdoms, and it, too, has its covenant. The covenant is Salvation—"The Lord knoweth them that are His," they are to be redeemed out of an evil world and saved. In this kingdom they are in a state of salvation, as we saw last Sunday. The kingdom is the kingdom of Salvation, and that is God's part of the covenant. But our part, what is it? It is this—"Let every one that nameth—every one that is baptised—the name of Christ, depart from iniquity." It is the covenant of Salvation on the part of God—the covenant of holiness on the part of man. And of this He has given us a sign, and the sign is baptism—"Go ye, and make disciples of all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Baptism is an external and visible sign, and, therefore, we learn at once that the kingdom of which it is an entrance is an external and visible kingdom—it is an universal sign, the means of giving it exists everywhere—water, wherein it is commanded man shall be baptised and received into His kingdom. It is, therefore, the sign of a visible and catholic kingdom, of a visible and Catholic Church, as we call it, and, moreover, it is pre-eminently not only catholic, but unsectarian. We hear the word unsectarian used strangely sometimes by those who have a confused idea of its meaning. The meaning of unsectarian is this—where all men should and ought to unite. And this rite is above all others unsectarian. It is for all men, and it implies belief in Him who has commanded it, and it may be administered not exclusively by ministers of any one sect, of any one Church, but by laymen. You laymen should remember that. In the order and discipline of the Church the administration of this rite is limited to the clergy "for the greater security, and the due and right performance of it," but, notwithstanding, lay baptism is a right and a valid thing. Baptism "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and with water, as the Lord commanded it, is a valid baptism. How strange, then, to suppose that when the clergy of our Church insist on the Lord's command of baptism, and order all men to bring their children, who have not been so baptised, they are exalting the privileges and rights of the clergy, and that they cannot come into Christ's kingdom without the help of the clergy! Our Lord has not said so, and the clergy do not say so, and if there is one thing in our Church witnessing to catholicity and un-

sectarianism it is the right of baptism. Baptism is the outward and visible sign, a sure covenant of God's kingdom, in which God covenants to save, and man covenants to believe and obey. Now let us very briefly just refer to the first part of this covenant to-day—the covenant we make or the thing we promise to God when we enter His kingdom. It is, in the first place, a covenant of renunciation—we are to give up something as we enter into God's kingdom; then it is a covenant of belief—we are to believe something; and then it is a covenant of obedience—to renounce that that lies outside the kingdom, to believe in Him who rules the kingdom, and to obey the laws of the kingdom, which are His laws. This is what we promise in baptism, and this is what baptism signifies for us. In other words, it is a covenant of renunciation. To pass into the inner kingdom we must pass out of the kingdom which lies outside it, that kingdom which is not of Christ, but of His enemy, the Devil—a kingdom He is pledged to destroy. We must pass from the kingdom of darkness, with its works of lust, and we then pass unto the kingdom of light as we pass out of the other kingdom. This kingdom is typified—and has laws distinct and visible—by baptism, which means the dipping under water, the natural and striking image of Christ, and of His rising from death unto life. But that rite is not for many of us so significant in this respect as it once was, because we do not require of all men who enter the Catholic Church of Christ that they should be baptised by complete immersion. No, charity, common sense, naturally suggested to us that dipping in water was not the essence of the rite, and pouring water over the face, though a curtailed ceremony, expresses the significance of the rite, viz., that men should die to one kingdom, and rise to the other. Sprinkling is merely an abridgment of the rite of immersion. But any parents who desire it may have a child dipped, if it is done, of course, warily and with obvious caution against risk in this variable climate of ours, There is such a thing as common sense in our religion, and common sense by degrees taught the early Christian Church where safety, where health, rendered dipping impossible, as in the case of the infirm, the sick, or the dying, this abridgment—sprinkling, should take its place. But our Church lays no stress on sprinkling as distinct from immersion, and those who prefer immersion have a right to demand it by the hands of the Church's minister. I cannot go at any great length into this covenant of religion we enter into at our baptism, but I will briefly sketch it for you, intending to return to it next Sunday. This covenant, as I have said, is first one of renunciation. What is it we give up? We renounce "the Devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and the sinful lusts of the flesh." Now, it is impossible in one of these short afternoon sermons to speak to you on these three heads, and I will take one which is most commonly misunderstood first, and treat it briefly. Most of us can broadly understand what it is to renounce "the devil and all his works," and most of us understand the renunciation of "the sinful lusts of the flesh," of which I will say something to you on a following Sunday. But to-day I will speak a few minutes on "the pomps and vanities of this wicked world," and I do so because one word in that sentence is most commonly misunderstood by those, especially children who learn the Church Catechism. The renunciation of the "vanities' of the world may take to mean the renouncing of pride but that is expressed in "pomp." The vanities, mean the untruths, the unrealities of the world. Vanity is an unreal thing, and, as the Bible says, "A man walketh in a vain shadow." It does not mean a conceited shadow; it means a vain unreal thing, a thing in which he is not what he appears to be. We renounce the pomps and unrealities of this wicked world. Understand, we do not renounce the world, but all that is evil in the world. Now, that, again, is a very sad mistake that men make from time to time when they suppose that renouncing the world is their duty. There was a time in the history of the Christian Church when the world around was so horribly saturated with sin and infamy that men fled out from it as it were, into the wilderness and the desert, where they thought they could be saved from the world. They made a very great mistake. In the first place, they forgot it was their duty to stop in the world and make it better, and to be, as it were, its leaven and salt, and that they were leaving it to its own corruption —running away from the battle-field where God had put them. And another thing—they did not get away from what they wished to renounce—they took the world with them. It was not the world they had to renounce, but the pomps and vanities, the unrealities of the world, and the world may be in man's heart even if he keeps apart in solitude from all mankind. You can no more keep out unreality by going away from it than you can keep out the fog by building a wall—it will rise above the wall, it will penetrate through the crevices, until it fills the interior with its dank moisture—because no mechanical contrivance can keep it out, and so no isolation of cell or convent can keep the world out of man's heart. It is the unreality of the world, the vanity of the world, we are to renounce. And wherein consists the vanity and unreality of the world? It is the false appearances we are to renounce. The false appearance is this—when the vanity of the world appears to man, or manifests itself to man, as his god, his religion—when the world is for man in the place of God, then does the world become an unreal and a deceiving thing. When man lives in the world as if all things, all time, was everything, and eter-

nity nothing, regarding only its customs, fearing only its terrors, loving only its joys, and being unconscious of the true world and life, and the God of that life, as if he was to live here for ever and ever, then the world becomes for him an unreal and deceiving thing, and that is the world we are to shun—it is the world we put in the place of God. "Give me the portion of goods belonging unto me," said the prodigal son. They were good things; they belonged to him rightfully, and he asked his father for them. Where was the sin?—that he wanted to take them from his father. He took them out in a far country, and there he starved, because, good as they were in themselves, they were unreal to him from the use he made of them. They had no aspect of good apart from God, and therein laid their unreality. Men talk of renouncing the world—that amusement or this amusement, this pursuit or this manner of living, and persons using it mean by "the world" something they do not practice and somebody else does. When a man professes to shun the world he forgets the vanities of the world in his own home, and in his own heart. It is not another man's world we are to shun, but our own world, that in our circumstances, our positions, be it what it may, which we are putting in the place of God. The world is the world God has made, and which we are striving to have and enjoy without God—that is the vanity, the unreality, the dissipation, and that is what we promise to renounce as we enter into the kingdom of Christ, a kingdom where there is reality and no dissipation, a kingdom filled with the realities of the spiritual world, and the true and real power and energy of God, and, therefore, the true and real power of enjoying, of living, for God. And when we say we renounce "the pomps and vanities of the world" we mean this—everything that attracts us from God; it may be innocent and enjoyable in itself, but if we make it our idol, and put it in the place of Him that made it, it becomes all pomp and vanity, and it is that thing we should forsake. That is the meaning of one part of our covenant of renunciation, one part, and one part only, of the inscription of that seal that marks the sure foundation of God on which His kingdom rests—"Let everyone that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity."

---

THE *Melbourne Argus* states that £1,116 has been subscribed for a testimonial to the ex-Bishop, and that a draft for that amount will be forwarded to Dr. Moorhouse, together with an elegantly bound copy of the address read at the farewell meeting.

THE Bishop of Manchester has appointed the following gentlemen his examining chaplains:—Archdeacon Anson, rector of Birch-in-Rusholme; Canon Birley, rector of St. Philip's, Hulme; and Dr. Thomas G. Bonney, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and late Commissary to his lordship when Bishop of Melbourne.

## AN ORDINATION SERMON.

BY THE VERY REV. F. SWIFT, M.A., DEAN OF CLONMACNOIS.

SERMON PREACHED AT THE ORDINATION OF DEACONS AT ALL SAINTS' CHURCH, MULLINGAR, ON MAY 2ND, 1886.

"They that have served well as deacons gain to themselues a good standing and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus."—1 TIMOTHY iii. 13.

OUR blessed Lord, before He withdrew His visible presence from His Church, carefully made provision for its future stability. He separated the twelve Apostles from the rest of the disciples, and in their hands was left the guidance of the infant Church. For a considerable time the Apostles seem to have lived almost entirely at Jerusalem, and only to have occasionally travelled to other places to preach the Gospel, or to confirm those who had been converted by others. So far as we can see, they never resided very long in any place except at Jerusalem. They seem to have exercised a general supervision over the whole Church, and doubtful questions were submitted to their decision. This could not continue very long. It must soon have become evident that a resident ministry was absolutely necessary to keep the Church members together, and to provide for their instruction in the principles of Christianity. For this purpose the Order of Presbyters was formed. We have no direct account of the first institution of this order, but from the casual allusions made to it both in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles, it is evident that it must have existed from a very early time. We have direct evidence of the institution of the Order of Deacons. It is described at length in the sixth chapter of the Acts. From the account that is there given, it is clear that the intention at first was that they were to be employed in the more secular part of the ministry. They were to look after the poor, and to see that the money that was contributed was fairly and equally distributed among all. But it is evident that this was not the whole of their duty. They were also employed in spiritual things. Stephen, we are told, was a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and we know, from his speech recorded in the 7th of Acts, that he was a bold and able preacher of the truths of the Gospel. Philip also is mentioned at a later period. He is called an evangelist, and is described as one of the seven. I think we may fairly conclude that these seven deacons, while they assisted the Apostles by relieving them of the secular part of their duties, also assisted them by preaching and ruling the Churches. But besides these two orders, we have distinct evidence of the existence of a third which was superior to both these. St. Paul, in writing to Timothy, evidently places him

in a higher position than the other presbyters. He was not only to ordain presbyters, but he was first to examine carefully into their lives and conduct, so that he might lay hands suddenly on no man. He also gives him directions how he was to try presbyters against whom a charge was brought: "Against a presbyter receive not an accusation except at the mouths of two or three witnesses." But then if they were proved guilty they were to be reproved in the sight of all, that others also may fear. Titus also was placed in a similar position in the Church of Crete. But besides these we find that even the Apostles thought it necessary to place one of their body in a position of authority over the rest. This is evident from the account of the Council of Jerusalem, which is mentioned in the 15th chapter of Acts. At that Council both Peter and Paul were present. They were probably the most active and the most distinguished of the Apostles, yet both these men only argue and speak as ordinary members of the Council. But James does not argue. He sums up what has been said, and then gives his decision: "Wherefore my judgment is that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles turn to God." This is very different from the language that was before used by Peter, and from what an ordinary member of the Council would use. I think, therefore, we can have no difficulty in accepting the statement of our Prayer Book. "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." I know, indeed, that among some opponents of our Church great stress is laid on the fact that the names "bishop" and "presbyter" are frequently used as convertible terms. But the name applied is a matter of very small importance. The fact of the existence of these orders is, I think, very clearly proved. Now the subject of the Christian ministry is brought very forcibly before us to-day by the service that is to be used by the Bishop at the Ordination of the two persons who are to be admitted to the order of deacons. The service is a very solemn one, and brings before you the great and important duties you will be called on to perform. It is one of the most important days of your lives. In some respects it is even more important to you than the day on which you will be admitted to the order of priesthood. The Deaconate has now come to be regarded as a step to the order of priests. Whether this is the best arrangement or not is a question which I do not feel myself competent to enter on. But practically you take upon yourselves to-day the duty of ministering to the Church of God. It is a duty voluntarily undertaken by you, knowing beforehand its great difficulties and responsibilities. To you will be committed the care and oversight of a portion of that Church for which Christ died. It will be your duty to teach and expound to those members of that Church who are committed to your charge the doctrines of Scripture as they are explained in our Prayer Book. It will also be your duty to give to your flock an example of a holy and religious life. You must show them the effect which the doctrines and the example of our blessed Master should produce on the daily lives of all his followers. Teaching and preaching will have but little effect unless they are followed up by a holy and consistent life. The ministers of Christ are put in a very prominent position. All their actions are carefully watched, and there are many only too ready to remark if they do anything that seems to be inconsistent with the high standard they are bound to teach. When we consider all the things that are required of the minister of the Gospel, we may well say "who is sufficient for these things?" We know that in ourselves we are very weak, but God has promised that His strength shall be made perfect in our weakness. If we were to trust to our own strength we would be only as the branch severed from the vine. It is only when we are joined to Christ by a living faith, when we can go to Him for support in all our trials, that we can properly perform the duties of our high vocation. Let no other duties therefore ever interfere with your private prayers to God. Your diligence in prayer will soon show itself in the success of your work. Another thing you should be diligent in, is reading; constant study is absolutely necessary if you would make progress in the knowledge of the Christian doctrines. It should be made a matter of conscience to study for a certain time each day. Real, systematic study is what is required. Careless, desultory reading will never have much effect; it is more likely to weaken the mind. In all your work, whether at home or in your parishes, try always to realise that you are working for God. This will prevent you from falling into that careless, merely professional way of doing your work. When we are constantly engaged in doing the same round of duties it is often very hard to avoid falling into a perfunctory way of doing our work. This you should always be watchful against. Such work is always badly done, and of very little value. Parochial visiting also should be done systematically. It is only by constant house-to-house visitation that you can really know your people, and without this intimate knowledge you cannot be of much use to them. If you wish really to influence them you must show them that you take a personal interest in them and their affairs. We can easily see from all this, that the life of a clergyman is one of labour and responsibility. He has need of all the comfort and encouragement we can give him. But he must rely for his help upon God, for whom he is labouring, and who has promised that He will never forsake His Church. Perhaps one of the greatest trials a clergyman has, is the apparent

want of success of his ministry. He may sometimes labour on for years, and see no fruit of all his toil; but let him not despond. There may be much fruit which he does not see. The best work does not always produce its effect immediately. It may be years and years afterwards that the seed that has been sown may spring and bear fruit to eternal life. Let us work on in patience and hope, and leave the result to God. No work done honestly and faithfully for God and His glory will ever be done in vain. Such work God will always bless. It may not produce the effect we laboured for, but it will produce some effect. Let us then, work faithfully for God, knowing that we are working for a loving Father, whose mercy is over all his works.

## HOW TO OVERCOME THE WORLD.

By the Rev. A. D. PRINGLE, M.A., Vicar of Blakeney, Gloucestershire.

Sermon Preached at Blakeney on the Fifth Sunday after Easter, May 30th, 1886.

"Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."—John xvi. 33.

THERE are some passages in the Bible which declare the essential being and attributes of the eternal God. These stand alone. Without any context they are complete, such as the name Jehovah, I AM, the self-existent One; or the Redeemer exalted on high, I AM, Alpha and Omega. Thus the Old Testament and the New Testament in these words, come before us as one revelation of God, from the one Divine existence. But by far the greater number of texts in Scripture cannot be severed from the context, though readers and preachers deal with these as complete declarations of God's will to man, and by doing so increase the difficulties in our faith, and enlarge controversy. The words I have taken this evening may be dealt with as a part or a whole; in either way they are complete.

I. Take the words, "I have overcome." II. "I have overcome the world."

First, we see by the eye of faith in these words, "I have overcome," an assertion of certain facts, grander than the superscription by Pilate. All seemed lost, and the sufferer conquered. "It is finished" might sound in the ears of Jew and Gentile merely as a dying man's cry, "Now I die." All believers and some unbelievers regard Jesus' death as a triumph. His death has been viewed by gifted writers as a wonderful instance of His own belief in His mission, even to suffering death rather than withdraw from His pretensions; and, for fear the fact of Christ suffering and dying so heroically on the Cross should be deemed singular heroism, writers have taken pains to try and show that other men have sealed their belief by their death. I will not stop to inquire the difference in the lives of the sufferers, or the essential difference in their mission. I am merely noticing one point of agreement with these writers, viz., their admiration of the heroism of Jesus. In this sense He could say, "I have overcome," where virtue and innocence were matched against vicious and cruel persecution even to death.

Behold the empty sepulchre! Again we seem to hear the words of the Lord Jesus, "I have overcome." The dazzling brightness of the angel of the Lord had stricken down the Roman guard, so that they became as dead men. No mortal eye apparently beheld the King of Glory rise triumphant. If we may with all reverence imagine His words as His glorious form went forth, they might well be, "I have overcome. The great stone was sealed and the watch set; but I passed through all as though nothing were there."

Again, we may say the same of Christ after His resurrection. The words apply to His sudden appearance and disappearance to His faithful followers. The ordinary laws of nature were put aside. "I have overcome," in my Divine manhood those material powers investing man. We may hear the same words, "I have overcome" as the King of Glory, before the eyes of watching witnesses, showed Himself superior to nature's most universal and binding law; gradually He ascended, until the cloud hid Him from the gaze of the bystanders. That proof which He gave before the eyes of many displayed the Christ as complete conqueror, knowing no controlling law except His own will. The Ascension says, "I have overcome," but was it more remarkable than the proofs He had often given of His Divinity? I cannot think so.

The last instance we may take is from the first chapter of Revelation. Read the vision which St. John beheld, from verses 13 to 18. The last survivor of the Apostles sums up many things, past and future, in few words. "I AM he that was dead and is alive for evermore, and have the keys of death and Hades." Around that whole vision of the Revelation from first to last chapter, we see the words, as it were inscribed in flaming characters: "I have overcome."

II. Take the words of Jesus at greater length, "I have overcome the world;" and this conquest may be illustrated by recurring to the scenes already mentioned. The term *world* in the New Testament has several meanings. A notable one is the evil that is in the world, arising from individual and aggregate sin, the punishment which accompanies sin in the individual and in the many. The Saviour on the Cross gives a meaning to His own words, "I have overcome the world," in accepting the sin of man and taking its punishment, and displaying Himself as the Healer of the nations. One passage is enough as an illustration,—St. Paul addressing the Ephesians,

in the second chapter, from the 14th to the 18th verses. Christian sentiment has embodied the same truth in the well-known lines, "Rock of ages, cleft for me." In Christ's victory over the grave, we have another meaning of the word "world" brought before us. One of the greatest evils of this world, viewed from a human point of view, is the law of death which passes on all, and "the fear of death." Death reigned from Adam to Moses; even that man of such physical powers unspent, whose law has been received so widely and so long, bows to his doom; still downward the conquest of death extended, and will go on to overcome us and ours. The Conqueror of death has not removed this burden of evil inherent to this world; but He removed its sting, and He did more. The resurrection told us of real victory over that terrible foe to the world of humanity—death. But more, "the fear of death" is taken away. The Saviour, as the great head of His Church, looking at the world's foe, exclaims: "I have overcome the world of death, not only in my own case, but for all my brethren; fear it not, be of good cheer."

Again, we may hear the Saviour's words re-echoed by the Church of God. He showed His power over nature's laws in His spiritual body; the Christian, enlightened by Him, can often exclaim, "I have overcome the world," in the wondrous power he exerts to subdue nature's evils in mind and body for man's alleviation. Much of the power of the material world has been overcome by man, civilised and uncivilised. The lands of Egypt, Greece, and Rome show records of the spirit that is in man triumphing over the material world; but we must look to a Christian era to see the Spirit of Christ leading men to devise ways and means for alleviating human misery by grappling with worldly forces. The evils which affect man's body are forces acting irregularly. One branch of human science has been amazingly beautified by the Spirit of Christ energising the mind of men to combat with or overcome pain and disease. Some of the most remarkable instances of these forces of evil in the world being defied or relieved are found in the physician's calling, and discoveries made not to earn mere worldly fame. Two cases I may mention: Simpson was actuated by this high Christian feeling, and it carried him to his great discovery for alleviating pain and deadening sensibility, even at the risk of life to himself. Astley Cooper made it the pastime of his retirement to cure the horse discarded by others as worthless from age or disease; he brought the forces of his Christian spirit and ability to grapple with the forces of weakness, accident, and age. The cases, too, are not singular, where the *virus* has been taken from the diseased by the Christian healer. Sometimes has this spiritual force (for so it may be called in a measure) triumphed; but we know of cases where this fine spiritual force has failed, the healer has died a martyr's death without the martyr's fame.

Another example of a different kind I may give, illustrating these words of our Divine Lord, "I have overcome the world." I have imagined these words as very appropriate to our Lord's ascension, and to the laws of the material world being then set aside before many witnesses. The whole subject of the human spirit acting apart from the material frame, and showing independence of its tabernacle, comes before us in connection with dreams and dreamland; no explanation that I know of, accounting for spiritual activity while the body sleeps, is at all satisfactory. The veritable being seems to wander to scenes far removed from where the body sleeps. Memory restores to us "voices gone." The communion of earth with heaven seems very real, only less apparent than the vision of St. Stephen.

This may be driven too far, but instances of the kind have occurred. St. Paul's elevation of his spiritual being, above and beyond all his material frame, is too distinctly recorded to regard the whole subject with incredulity. The case of our Lord's spiritual power on earth overcoming the world's forces has been reproduced, with some difference I allow—but you may judge for yourselves. "The angel of the Lord opened the prison doors, and brought the Apostles, St. Peter and St John, forth." We see this again when we read of Philip, now in company with the eunuch of Ethiopia, between Jerusalem and Gaza; "then, Philip was found at Azotus."—In Acts xii. we find another case of material hindrances giving way before superior spiritual force. "When they were past the first and the second ward, they came unto the iron gate that leadeth unto the city, which opened unto them of his own accord." Another case, in the life of St. Paul points to the same fact that, not only could the Lord of all say, "I have overcome the world in its material bonds," but the same has been true of His followers. St. Paul did not escape from the gaol of Philippi by undoing locks and bars. These fled before the servant of the risen Christ, "for all the doors were opened, and every one's hands were loosed."

Lastly, these words may find, do find a continual fulfilment, in the victory which overcometh the world of sin and evil in ourselves; a victory to be gained by union with Christ as our risen head. This is the victory which overcometh the world, our faith in the Son of God. Through the visible body come the temptations of the world and the flesh; through our spirit, the attacks of the Evil One, and he has one aim, to destroy the victory of the Divine Son of God for man. Not by any human and material force can the Christian say, "I have overcome the world" of self and sin, of death and him who has the power of death, Satan. Such conquest must be gained by spiritual power, coming from Christ Himself working

with us and in us. The forces opposed to us in the contest are most to be feared when they are most underrated. The follower of Christ, who earnestly seeks His presence and His grace, may go on "faint and yet pursuing." But let him hear the voice of Jesus say, "Be of good courage, I have overcome the world."

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 29, 1886.

## CLERGY SUSTENTATION.

IT must be a matter for rejoicing among some of the beneficed clergy, that the Incumbents of Benefices Loan Extension Bill, has been introduced by a noble layman, in the House of Lords; and it is much to be hoped, that it will shortly pass into law; unless it be that Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Carvell Williams, and other members of the Liberation Society, who have seats in the House of Commons, oppose the measure, hoping thereby to forward their own scheme of Disestablishment, by endeavouring to suppress anything that savours of Church Reform. We trust however, that Mr. Gladstone will stand firm on this matter, and it will be supported by all right-minded men, no matter what may be their political colour.

The Bill, however, only mentions the reduction of clerical incomes, through the diminished letting value of glebe land, and says nothing about the diminished value of tithe rent-charge. In many places clerical incomes have been reduced considerably through the prevalent agricultural depression, and at the present time there seems to be no silver lining whatever behind the dark cloud which still hangs over us. In some places in the Midland Counties, livings have decreased so much in value, that it is difficult to get any one to take them. We have in our mind a benefice in episcopal patronage, which some ten years ago was worth between four or five hundred a year; and yet not very long ago it was difficult to get any one to take it.

In some parts of the country, money has been lent by the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, on livings where the income is almost, if not entirely, derived from tithe rent-charge, and this rent-charge has been the security which has been accepted, and, although the Act does not specifically mention tithe rent-charge, we trust that these livings will come under the working of the Act; for, if in one place the letting value of glebe land has considerably diminished, we must not shut our eyes to the fact that, in consequence of the low price of corn, tithe rent-charge has decreased likewise; so much so, that at the present time, £100 of tithe according to the Commutation Act is now only worth somewhere about £90 10s. 3½d. —a fact which speaks for itself, and therefore where livings have been mortgaged on the security of the rent-charge, they have a claim just as much as those whose incomes are derived from glebe land. We trust that this fact will not escape the attention of those who have charge of the Bill.

We feel also that it is much to be desired that greater discretion should be exercised in the granting of loans for the extension and erection of parsonage houses. At the present time a vicar or rector who wants to have his house enlarged, get plans drawn up, together with specifications, and sends them to the Rural Dean, who signs them, and they are then sent on to the Bishop for his approval; the living, it may be, is in a far-off, out-of-the-way corner of the diocese; he knows very little of the circumstances of the case —that is, from personal knowledge—possibly has never been inside the house, but on the representation that is made signs the plans, and the money is lent forthwith. We maintain, that in these matters, more discretion should be exercised, and would venture to suggest that in each archdeaconry, or if that were found to be too large an area, that in each rural deanery, there should be a committee of the clergy, aided by some of the influential laity, who should examine the house, and the plans, and if found suitable, and withal *necessary*, should agree to them, and if not, refuse them. We believe that this would have the effect of putting a stop to the undue enlargement of parsonage houses, and at the same time prevent heavy burdens falling upon future incumbents.

If the laity complain of the depression in trade and agriculture, the voice of the clergy should also be heard; they have suffered silently far too long. Whether the price of corn will ever rise to anything like a sum which will afford the clergy adequate remuneration from tithe rent-charge, time alone will prove; for not only has the value decreased, and as some affirm, will continue to decrease, but in many cases it is almost impossible to collect it, because the farmers have not the money to pay with. It is, however, much to be desired that some other source of income should be provided, that the tithe should be paid by the landlords, who really are liable; if this were done, much of the friction between farmers as tithe-payers and clergy as tithe-owners would be avoided. It is feared by many that the ultimate result of the depression will be, that the land will

go out of cultivation, and that yeomen and tenant-farmers will be tradesmen of the past, a result which all must deplore, no matter what may be the hopes held out by those who would despoil the landowners, and divide the land among the labourers with the questionable benefits of the now proverbial "three acres and a cow."

## THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND FUNERAL AND MOURNING REFORM ASSOCIATION.

THIS Association held a successful annual meeting on the 22nd inst., and we believe that by having boldly taken a new departure in advocating the *natural* mode of "earth to earth" burial without the intervention of imperishable coffins, it will more rapidly attain its object. We must not, however, forget that it has done a great and good work in the past almost wholly and solely through the agency of its enthusiastic and indefatigable secretary, the Rev. F. Lawrence. He has in truth, by his great labours, established a substantial and practical plea against the Disestablishment of the Church of England, which in the day of reckoning will, we believe, not be forgotten. We heartily congratulate him and his Society on their new departure and adoption of the "earth to earth," which is the natural, system of burial, in contradistinction to the non-natural systems of either unduly delaying the resolution of the body by the use of vaults, imperishable coffins, etc., or by unduly hastening its resolution by means of cremation. We regard both of these non-natural methods as equally unscientific and injurious to the living, and we trust that the Church of England Funeral Reform Association will in a short time be the means of putting a stop to both of them. It is necessary that it should be more widely known and more liberally supported by both clergy and laity.

WE desire to call the attention of our readers to the important culinary and medicinal condiment, MAGNETIC IRON SEA SALT, announced in our advertising columns. It is well known that common salt evaporated from sea water is sharper, cleaner to the taste, and more invigorating than that which is dug from the salt mines. This article has in addition a small percentage of magnetic iron combined with it, which rather increases than lessens its palatability. It is certain that there can be no better vehicle for the administration of iron to the very numerous class of persons, including nearly all residents in large towns, who require this vital element of the red blood to absorb the oxygen from the atmosphere, and carry it to all the tissues and organs of the animal body. The spectroscope has revealed to us that light, especially direct sunlight, is nature's vehicle for supplying iron to the red blood of animals, and chemistry teaches us that when we endeavour to supply it artificially by the stomach, we must always administer it *at the same time* as we give solid food, which ensures its being dissolved and assimilated in some degree by the acids of the gastric juice. The great advantage of this elegant, tasty, and agreeable condiment, in our estimation, is that it ensures the iron being taken in conjunction with solid food, and consequently secures its absorption into the Red Blood, that great fly-wheel, as it were, of the animal machine. We regard this preparation as a most useful sanitary invention, and gladly commend its use to such of our readers as, by residence in smoky cities, etc., require the artificial administration of iron.

THE venerable Church Building Society, as the Chairman called it, though ten years younger than himself, held its sixty-eighth anniversary on the 21st inst. Its income is small—much smaller than it ought to be considering the important work of which it forms the nucleus. An expenditure of £6,000 is not much for the encouragement of building twenty-three new churches, rebuilding seven, and rearranging forty-seven others.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### FREE TRADE.

SIR.—If it is not a fact, as "B" insinuates, that the farmers are handicapped, then I do not know where you will find your facts. Half the farmers are on the verge of bankruptcy. Has "B" ever in his life lived for an hour in an agricultural district? If he has, then I should think he neither used his eyes nor his ears.

"B" thinks "a condition of fredom of production and exchange of commodities is not, so far as he can see [not very far I trow], absolutely inpossible." I challenge him to discuss the practicability of such a condition.

This is rather astounding: "Neither the English producer nor the foreign producer pays, or should pay, anything to our Government for the privilege of selling his produce." There are two assertions here: (1) No taxes are paid for the privilege of selling; (2) no taxes ought to be paid. (1) is not true; (2) begs the question. It is quibbling to say what the Government do with the taxes, when the question is as to what is taxed. Besides, if this aspect be considered, it is easy to see that the governed have a right to be protected against the inroads of foreigners, Inroads take divers shapes. Living costs much in England; it costs little on the Continent. The products of labour on the Continent will in consequence be less costly. These coming free to England constitute a real and very serious inroad upon the Englishman's means of subsistence. The foreigner lives, and he starves. And to this end he is governed!

I think "B's" description of "his" prosperous trades carries its own condemnation with it. Of this, however, your readers must be the judges.

A few words are always sufficient to embody a principle. It would aid us very much to understand the bearing of the case if "B" would formulate the principle which underlies the argument in the work to which he refers. We have not all the leisure to study such philosophical works as he thinks needful to understand the common affairs of everyday life. We can, however, appreciate the value of a principle tersely put. May I suggest therefore, as we are meek and willing to be taught, that he propound the principle which explains all our ills? It shall have due consideration.

Let me assure "B" that I am profoundly struck with the evidence of erudition with which his letter abounds. I am, however, a practical man and know that two and two make four. I also appreciate, and this very fully, the difference between a full stomach and an empty one.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage.
May 22, 1886.

## WHAT CAN A SPIRITUAL BODY DO? WHAT IS A SPIRITUAL BODY?

SIR,—I am sorry if I gave offence to "Anxious Enquirer." I did not mean to say that what he said was nonsense. I only asserted it as an abstract position, as I might of "two and two make five."

2. When it is asserted that a spiritual body can do this or that, which is a mere abstract position, we may well demur and ask, what is a spiritual body? There is nothing self evident in the matter.

3. We are told of a body being present after the manner of spirits. What does this mean? Spirits are not omnipresent but go from place to place.

4. Even of the Deity, what does it mean, "If I go down to Hell thou art there also?" For my part, I understand no more than that the Deity is everywhere present, by His knowledge, power, and grace. Let who will go farther.

5. Jeremy Taylor shows the absurdity of supposing that our Lord's Body extends through all space.

6. A contemporary, in its present number, says, "Virtualists say that the bread and wine communicate the same grace to recipients as though they were that which they represent." This is not exactly what Bishop Bull says. "By, or upon the sacerdotal benediction, the Spirit of Christ, or a Divine virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and therefore they are said to be, and are, the Body and Blood of Christ" Bishop Cosin, one of the Savoy bishops, says the same: "Christ from Heaven reacheth down to us the Divine Virtue of His flesh." I might name more of our greatest divines, but I have said enough to show that we share the name of Virtualists in very good company.

7. It is quite vain to argue from the words, "This is my Body." As Bishop Andrewes shows, this refers to "My Body broken," my *cadaver*, but as our Lord is now alive, His *cadaver* does not now exist at all.

8. Another reason against the argument from the words, "This is, etc." is that the change is produced by the assertion and therefore that, when the assertion is made, the change has not taken place. This, if I recollect right, is shown by Bishop Taylor.

9. Great stress is laid upon our Lord's Body entering the room when the doors were shut. But, what if the wall was miraculously opened for Him to pass through? At any rate it must be shown that a spirit is omnipresent, which I deny. Newman's theory of swift motion is childish, much better to keep to his other illustration of the sun present by its effects. (See Tract No. 90, and his letter to Fawcet.)

10. "Anxious Enquirer" seems to think the controversy useless. But unless we are to believe, "we know not what," I think it of vital importance. He says no one can judge fairly of the meaning of the black rubric who is not aware of the change of phrase, from "real and essential" to "corporal." I am well aware of the substitution, and of the reason for so orthodox a change. But what then? My opinion remains as it was. I am also well aware that it was against adoration that the black rubric was launched. But it is founded on the fact that there is no presence of any body, even a spiritual body, except in Heaven, as even a spiritual body cannot be in two places at once. If this assertion is false, then adoration may follow, and indeed, as a contemporary says, must follow; so that the adoration, which the black rubric was to prevent may still be lawfully practised.

11. If it is desirable that we should put a reasonable meaning upon a rubric which we profess to be true, I think the controversy anything but useless. If it be idolatry—normal at least—to adore, as present, what is present locally in Heaven alone, then the controversy seems anything but useless. Besides it really turns upon the truth or falsehood of transubstantiation, which was an "*Articulus stantis Ecclesiæ*" of our Reformers and divines ever since.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

## SELF-DENIAL.

SIR,—Evidently the Rev. J. P. Sandlands does *not* believe in self-denial, but he has no right to claim on his side the authority of Holy Scripture. In your last number he writes: "There is nothing whatever said in Scripture which leads us to suppose that self-denial (denying to self little pleasures) is a virtue"!

St. Paul tells us that we that are strong "*ought not to please ourselves*," and then adds: "Let *each one of us* please his neighbour for that which is good unto edifying. For Christ also pleased not Himself" (Rom. xv. 1-3). Happiness, as a rule, does accompany or follow each virtuous action, but the motive must *not* be the pleasing of self, but rather the pleasing of others, and the promotion of their edification. Most people hold that true Christian conduct is based upon the imitation of Christ, and the Apostle reminds us that even Christ "pleased not Himself."

Further, our Lord Himself has made a readiness to deny self a test of genuine discipleship. "If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me" (Luke ix. 23).

It is needless to say more as to the claims of the new theology which Mr. Sandlands would introduce amongst us. I believe most of us would say,—The old is better.

C. B. BRIGSTOCKE, Chaplain.

Homburg, Germany,
May 24, 1886.

## DISHONESTY ON BOTH SIDES.

SIR,—I have, I am afraid, tired you and your readers with my proofs, *ad nauseam*, of the dishonesty of your Romanisers. They would have us believe that bread vanishes on consecration, leaving only its species or appearances. But this is contrary to the words of the Catechism, "bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received." What He commanded to be received was not the ghost or shadow, but the reality. Again we read "receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine." What is called "the wretched Rubric" denies that our Lord's Body is on the altar, as it is in Heaven. Holy Scripture says that what our Lord calls His Body, is His Body, broken, that is slain; and that what He calls His Blood is His Blood, as shed out of His Body. But neither now exists in that state, but His Body is living. His words therefore cannot be taken in their literal sense, even if an assertion could produce a fact then asserted. But now I turn to the other side.

2. Our Irish Puritans are quite as dishonest as your Romanisers. We have in our New Preface, a question and answer, taken, it says, from the 28th Article. Now this is not the fact. Both are taken virtually from the Church Catechism. Of course, one is as good a source as the other, only that, as Master Brooke's Committee, in their report, said, "the teaching of the Church Catechism is less full than that of the Articles." (See Report, p. 29)

3. Now let us see what our Puritans wanted to effect. It was this, that the Body and Blood of our Lord are not given at all by the hands of the ministrant, but come directly from Heaven, independent of him and the bread. Faith, they said, is the sole means, excluding the bread, though the Catechism says, "as a means whereby we receive the same," the inward grace, or gift. Our Puritans were to work on the 28th Article, and they so set to work. But its language repelled them at once, "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." The sound members of our Synod wanted the question to be "After what manner are the Body and Blood given, taken, and eaten?" Either this, or not manipulate the words of the Article at all. But the Puritans refused to define how Christ's Body is given, taken, and eaten, or to recognise its being given and eaten at all. The orthodox said, if you refuse to define, you leave it open to be supposed that it is after the Roman and gross manner, that it is given and eaten. But no! nothing could move them. Well then, if the Article was impracticable, why not keep to the Catechism, and ask merely, "After what manner are the Body and Blood of Christ taken and received?" They might have thus given the question out of the Catechism, and then answered it out of the Article, "Only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby they are taken and received is faith." This would have been honest, "taken out of the said Catechism and the 28th of our Articles." But our Synod were bewitched into stating a falsehood. "one question and answer taken out of the 28th of the said Articles"

4. It may be asked, What could have induced them to make a mis-statement, and embody it, *in memoriam*, to future ages? I cannot say, except that they had bound themselves to explain the matter out of the Article, as "more full than the Catechism." So that they would pretend to give the question and answer out o the Article, whereas what the Article explains; is how the Body and Blood of Christ are "given and eaten," and not merely how they are "taken and received." "Taken and received" may go with the theory that the giver is God in Heaven, and not the administrator. No doubt this was the motive for the deceptive substitution of Catechism for Article. The words of the Article evidently refer to the inward gift, not to the bread, of which it could not be said, that it is "given, taken, and eaten only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." Bread is given, taken, and eaten after a natural manner. Any giving, taking, and eating of our Lord's Body, our Synod ignored, and would, as far as possible, eliminate. They might have omitted them from their new question and answer. From the Article they cannot; and it was most dishonest to pretend to quote the Article, while they really left out the most important part, because it was opposed to their theory. Thus I have done what I proposed—shown that dishonesty is not confined to one side. It is a sad thing that a dishonest, *ex parte* statement is embodied in the Preface, which our Church has enshrined for ever, in our Revised, though still most Catholic Prayer Book.

C. C. V.-G.

## Reviews and Notices.

"LECTURES ON CHURCH DOCTRINE" (First Series). By the Rev. V. H. Stanton, and others. Spalding, Cambridge. W. Kent & Co., London. Price 1s.

THE five lectures which this little volume contains were delivered in Great St. Mary Church, Cambridge, during Michaelmas Term 1885, with an object which perhaps it will be fairest to state in the exact language of the prefatory note. "It has been felt that one of the chief dangers to which members of the University and others engaged in intellectual pursuits are exposed in the present day, in regard to the Christian faith, arises from the vagueness of the notions prevalent about certain doctrines which are, or ought to be, 'most surely believed among us.' Accordingly, the aim of these lectures has been to supply, as far as possible, clear and definite statements of doctrine on the subjects treated of."

Nevertheless, "vagueness" is exactly the charge we bring against these lectures. They are "vague" as all lectures, or books, or speeches, must be in which terms are not clearly defined. Mr. Stanton, for instance, writing on the Holy Catholic Church, makes no attempt to distinguish—does not even seem to perceive the necessity for distinguishing—accurately and carefully between *unity* and *uniformity*. So, again, Mr. Mason on Baptismal Regeneration, writes meaninglessly, because he won't distinguish between regeneration and renewal; and will use, moreover, that unscientific word "conversion."

And again, Mr. Watson wastes much time in answering a statement, or rather, perhaps, we should say an aspiration, of Mr. H. C. G. Moule, who, in "Thoughts on Christian Sanctity," says "The union and contact [between Christ and His people] is immediate, spiritual. Nothing is to be between, not the most venerable and apostolic organisation, not the most precious of Christ-given ordinances!" What Mr. Moule means by this badly worded and rather hysterical sentence, is surely quite clear; he means

that the instrument is not to be allowed to become a substitute for the end. But Mr. Watson will not have the charity, (we grant that some charity is required) to understand it so, and asks Mr. Moule if we may not read our Bibles? Now, lectures are designed to teach, and for teaching, exactness is requisite; and first of all, an exact definition of terms. Herein these lectures fail therefore they do not teach.

---

AT the annual meeting of the Church of England Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, held at Grosvenor House, the Duke of Westminster presiding, the following characteristic letter was received by the secretary, the Rev. F. Lawrence :—"I entirely approve of the object of the Funeral Reform Association, but if I could stop people from wasting their money while they are alive they might bury themselves how they liked for aught I care.—Faithfully yours, John Ruskin." Among those who wrote regretting their inability to be present were the Earl of Dartmouth, Earl Nelson, Earl of Jersey, Viscount Cranbrook, Viscount Wolseley, the Bishop of Lichfield, the Bishop of Hereford, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, the Deans of Canterbury and Winchester, the Archdeacons of London and Westminster. The Chairman said the expense incurred by many of the poor at funerals was out of all proportion to the amount they could afford to spend for such purposes, and was frequently a very serious burden to the bereaved family. He hoped that the wealthy classes would set an example to the poor by avoiding ostentation in the matter of funerals and by returning to simple burial in plain earth. He concluded by moving the adoption of the report. The Lord Mayor of York seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously. The Bishop of London moved a resolution declaring that it was desirable to promote a fuller appreciation of the idea of Christian burial. His lordship wished they could get rid of the heathenish notion of the resurrection, which prompted men to keep the corruptible body separate from the earth as long as possible. That notion altogether fell short of the idea which St. Paul put before them, that the corruptible body was intended to be one day transformed into the spiritual body which should spring out of it, and that the corruptible elements in it ought to be restored to the earth as speedily as it was possible to restore them. He did not himself feel the slightest objection to cremation, but it was needful, perhaps, not only for the sake of preserving the body in certain cases, but for the sake of avoiding offence to the feelings of a large number of people, to put the matter away into the distant future. At any rate they might adopt that mode of burial which did not in any way preserve the body from its natural course in the earth. The resolution was seconded by Sir Richard Wilbraham, and carried unanimously. Mr. Seymour Haden proposed the third resolution, which was as follows :—"That the prevalent mode of burial is contrary to the mode plainly indicated in the Burial Service—namely, simple burial in the plain earth, and that a return to this simple mode is necessary on grounds sanitary and economic. That the rich be invited to set an example of simplicity and economy in all the details of funeral and mourning ceremonial." Dr. Septimus Gibbon seconded the resolution. Among the other speakers were Mr. W. F. Sabine, Mr. Burrows (Melbourne), and the Rev. J. G. Wood. The resolution was carried unanimously.

THE following memorial has been presented to the Southern Convocation by the English Church Union :—

"My Lord Archbishop.—As President of the English Church Union it is my duty most respectfully to lay before your Grace, and through your Grace before the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, the substance of resolutions of the Union passed on Friday, February 26, of the present year, in the two chief matters of Church defence and of reform in administration of the Church's office.

"1. We are persuaded that it is our duty to defend and to maintain to the best of our powers the historic position of the Church of England, with the endowments she possesses or may acquire.

"2. That it is a still higher duty to resist all proposals conflicting with the Church's paramount obligation to uphold the Catholic faith, and the Apostolic order and discipline, which are her inalienable heritage.

"3. We are persuaded, further, that the claim of the Church of England to be the National Church of England does not depend, in any manner or degree, on her reflecting, or representing, popular religious opinion; but on her Mission to the nation to bring it into, and to keep, preserve, and further it in, the obedience of the faith of which the Church is the Divinely constituted guardian.

"4. With regard to proposals for 'Church Reform,' called more properly proposals for 'Reform in the Administration of the Church,' we insist that the needs of the Church cannot, as they may not, be met by any schemes which trench upon the Divinely appointed order of her government, and which ignore the inherent distinction of office between clergy and laity.

"5. Further, we hold it to be essential that each and every measure of such reform in administration be either initiated in, and agreed to, or formally sanctioned by, the united authority of the Bishops and clergy in their Convocations.

"6. We desire most respectfully to assure your Grace and the whole Convocation of the Province of Canterbury of the faithful and hearty support of the Union in all such measures as may be judged to be for the better administration of the Church, upon the basis of the principles set forth above under the several heads of this memorial.

"More particularly we humbly request the attention of your Grace and the Bishops and clergy of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, to the points following, as being of primary importance :—

"(*a*) The right of the Church to decide finally for herself in all spiritual causes.

"(*b*) The better representation of the clergy in Convocation;

"(*c*) The restoration of diocesan synods;

"(*d*) The providing of a simpler and more expeditious method of dealing with morally criminous clerks;

"(*e*) The necessity, if in any parish it be thought desirable that an organisation of the laity for Church purposes should be formed, that such organisation should be limited to communicants;

"(*f*) The necessity for the application of Church discipline to the laity as well as to the clergy;

"(*g*) The adoption of measures for the better maintenance of the Church's law of marriage, at present impaired by the Divorce Acts and threatened by the 'Wife's Sister Bill;'

"*h*) The removal of abuses incident to the present exercise of Church patronage;

"(*i*) The repeal of so much of the Act of 25 Henry VIII., cap. 20, as subjects the Chapters and Bishops to the penalties of *præmunire* if they refuse to elect, confirm, or consecrate the nominee of the Crown.

"I have the honour to be, with every expression of the respect and obedience due to your Grace and the Bishops of your Grace's province, your Grace's faithful servant, "HALIFAX."

ACCORDING to the new issue of the *Tourists' Church Guide*, which gives particulars of 3,426 churches (or fifty more than in the last publication), there is a weekly celebration at them all with the exception of a few on the Continent. The number where there is a daily celebration is 156 (a decrease of one); vestments, 509 (an increase of sixty); incense, sixty (an increase of twenty-eight); altar-lights, 968 (an increase of ninety-nine); eastward position, 2,433 (an increase of 175); free and open, 1,559 (an increase of 143); open for private prayer, 1,634 (an increase of 171).

AN officer of the Church Army has just been sent to work amongst the militia at Swanage. Another is going from village to village in various parts of Norfolk preaching in a tent and acting under the parochial clergy. The encouragements to the work under Canon Money's direction has been so good that another vicar in Cheltenham has commenced this work with an officer from the training college in the Edgware Road. Others are shortly to be sent to Toronto, Ripley, Haslemere, Belfast, Whitechapel, Frant, Bayswater, and Notting Hill. The term "Army Barracks" which has appeared in some of the papers was not used at the annual meeting, nor has it ever been adopted by the society for the "Training Home" or any other building.

BISHOP MOORHOUSE has accepted the office of president of the Manchester and Salford Sanitary Association, which has been vacant since the death of Bishop Fraser. Dr. Prince Lee, the first Bishop of the diocese, was the first president. The Wesleyan ministers in the district have sent his lordship an address, in which they say:—"The late Bishop Fraser was pre-eminently distinguished by a noble catholicity of spirit; and in his successor we rejoice to welcome one who, in the great colonial bishopric over which he has so ably presided, has shown the same wide and generous sympathies. In the presence of the vast spiritual needs of this city and neighbourhood, and of the urgent religious and social problems which challenge the attention of the Christian Church, we feel that the time has come for Christians of every name to unite more cordially and actively in the maintenance of a pure and living Christianity, and in the promotion of all methods of social improvement and amelioration; and we earnestly hope that in the wide sphere in which we are called to labour in the service of the common Lord and Saviour, the spirit of Christian unity and fraternal co-operation may be more and more promoted and strengthened. We pray that you may be abundantly blessed and prospered in the exalted and responsible position to which you have been called."

THE Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of Durham and Manchester, have been requested by the Melbourne Church Assembly to select for them a Bishop in the room of Bishop Moorhouse.

TWO windows at Rusthall Church have been filled with stained glass as a memorial of the Rev. Cecil Moore, who was buried in the churchyard in August last. Mr. Moore worked with much zeal and devotion in the parish of St. John, Paddington, from January, 1879, to December, 1883, when, on account of failing health, he was obliged, much to the regret of the vicar, Sir E. Bayley, and of the congregation, to relinquish his duties. He was afterwards offered by the late Bishop of London the living of St. Mary's, Paddington, but his delicate health compelled him to decline the offer. The windows have been executed by Messrs. Heaton, Butler, and Bayne.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Anson, Ven. Archdeacon, Rector of Birch-in-Rusholme; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester.

Birley, Rev. Canon, Rector of St. Philip's, Hulme; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester.

Bonney, Rev. Thomas G., D.Sc., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester.

Browne, Rev. Charles Elrington, Vicar of Holme-next-the-Sea, Norfolk.

Dalton, Rev. Canon, Honorary Chaplain; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty the Queen.

Eykyn, Rev. Pitt, Formerly Vicar of Ashton Gate, Bristol; Vicar of Magor-cum-Redwick.

Gorton, Rev. Arthur Henry, M.A., Vicar of Denchworth, Berks.

Jennings, Rev. Arthur Charles, M.A., Rector of Kingstanley.

Jennings, Rev. Edward Linck, M.A., Minister of the New Church at Up-Hatherley.

Macphail, Rev. Edmund Whittingstall St. Maur, M.A., Rector of Letcombe, Bassett, Berks.

Sharpe, Rev. H. Edmund, M.A., Vicar of Whitchurch, Hants; Surrogate for Hants and the Isle of Wight.

Stewart, Rev. John Sinclair, M.A., Vicar of Winterbourne, Stoke.

Symonds, Rev. W., Rector of St. Thomas's, Stockport.

Thompson, Rev. J. Pullein, Association Secretary of the Colonial and Continental Church Society; Vicar of North Bow.

Walls, Rev. Richard Arthur, Rector of Letchworth.

Wannop, Rev. T. N., Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Haddington, N.B.; Canon of Edinburgh Cathedral.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Dodds, Rev. Henry Luke, M.A., for thirty years Vicar of Great Glen with Great Stretton, Leicestershire, on the 10th inst., at Great Glen, Leicestershire, aged 75.

Fletcher, Rev. John, B.D., formerly Canon and Incumbent of Christ Church, Newcastle, New South Wales, on the 20th inst., at 7, Hamilton-terrace, East Stonehouse, Plymouth, aged 68.

Mills, Rev. Alfred Wilson, for twenty-two years Vicar of St. Erth, on the 11th inst, aged 53.

Royds, Rev James, M.A., J.P., of Woodlands, Hartford, on the 14th inst., aged 64.

St John, Rev. Paulet, for many years Patron and Rector of the parishes of Mottisfont-cum-Lockerley and Dean, on the 18th inst., at Mottisfont Rectory, aged 76.

Tait, Rev. William, D.D., for twenty-one years Incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, Pau, at Folkestone, on the 19th inst.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE INDIAN AND COLONIAL EXHIBITION.

By the Rev. A. D. PRINGLE, M.A., Vicar of Blakeney, Gloucestershire.

Notes of a Sermon Preached at Blakeney, on Sunday, May 16th, 1886.

"And they turned aside thither, to go in and to lodge in Gibeah: and when he went in, he sat him down in a street of the city: for there was no man that took them into his house to lodging. And, behold, there came an old man from his work out of the field at even, which was also of Mount Ephraim; and he sojourned in Gibeah: but the men of the place were Benjamites. And when he had lifted up his eyes he saw a wayfaring man in the street of the city; and the old man said, Whither goest thou, and whence comest thou?"—Judges xix. 15-17.

THE two questions of the old man who met the wayfarer have another meaning not without interest, and an inner significance to which I shall refer. The history, as far as we need consider it now, is strangely connected with times long gone by and customs yet prevailing. Two men, master and servant, and another, were on a journey. They arrive at a place often mentioned in the books of Joshua, Judges, and Samuel. The sun had gone down, night approaching. These travellers were disappointed in finding a hostelry open. An old man met them who had taken up his abode in Gibeah, and seeing these wayfarers, he accosts them, "Whither come ye? whence go ye?"

I. We may notice the primitive manners and customs which these books (connecting links between Moses and the Kings) display. And these manners and customs have come down to our day in Palestine. People journeying, then and now, depend very much on their own resources; inns and inn-accommodation are limited. This case finds the like, when we read, "there was no room for them in the inn," only in this case, a kind-hearted old man gave a company of travellers shelter, but the Saviour of men was laid in a manger! For the Christ there was no hospitality; for these travellers it was forthcoming.

The same primitive condition of travelling and indebtedness to hospitality prevailed not so long ago, in the reign of Charles I., and probably very much in western and northern counties down to later times. Camels, of course, we and our forefathers are strangers to; but horses and asses were animals for pack-saddles and riding. Inns were few. Hospitality was generous.



Again, these same questions were put then, as they are put now, to wayfarers in North and South America, in Afghanistan, in the back parts of Turkey, "Whither goest thou? Whence comest thou?" In old days in England, even to this day in many places, men wish to know—who they have to deal with. When life and goods are to be thought of, it is important to find out whether those you meet are honest men.

The way taken by the old man to find out who they were seems very blunt to us. "Why did he ask these questions?" you may say. Why, simply to hear their speech. One man, dishonest through fear, was caught out by his tongue, "Thou art a Galilean, thy speech bewrayeth thee." The old man knew that he could tell whence they came by their dialect, just as you could tell a man in London from his speech if he came from your own county. There is no doubt about the power of the tongue. It brought an apostle into grievous trouble; though his tongue was afterwards his glory; he defended with courage his Lord and Master, whom once, through fear, he denied.

But why did the old man of Gibeah take to these wayfarers? The story is very old; but human nature, for good or for evil, ages very little. The reply to his questions brought them together. They came from the same place.

II. I said that this story had an inner as well as an outer side. Two great national events are now of great interest and importance to all of us, I mean the Indian and Colonial Exhibition and the Liverpool Exhibition.

1. These are "national events," for they have brought together all classes, from the highest to the humblest. There are some poor narrow-minded men in these days who have no honest cheer when they read of our beloved, and now aged, Queen coming forward as the nation's head to honour herself and her people, by opening these national exhibitions.

2. There is no kingdom which can present such scenes, such "gathering of the nations," such commercial enterprise, as our still United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. There is a pride which is wrong in the individual man; there is another kind of pride, which we may all feel in viewing these exhibitions, their opening, and their objects.

3. In no other age of the old world, or the new world, could such events have happened; because England's power, territorially and commercially, is far beyond that of former or present ages.

4. In no other age could you have witnessed such a reproduction of human industry and earth's productions; because the means of communication were such that all this industry, and all these products, could not have been centred under two such buildings, as you may see them in London and Liverpool, nor could all the resources of

the old world have collected them in so short a time.

III. This part of our subject connects itself with the old man of Gibeah's questions. These exhibitions bring together travellers from all parts of our land, and from all parts of the globe.

If the question is not asked, "Whence come ye?" it will be because the variety of tongue will show whence the sojourners came; and the question "Whence go ye?" will not be asked. The present concern with us all may be only to satisfy curiosity and enlarge our minds, and with the future goings of these people we are not concerned, but you will see, that this question has more which is considerable; it has its own inmost significance, on which we do not dwell now; "Whither comest thou? Whence goest thou?"

1. In most instances you will hear, in these exhibitions, the English tongue. Our mother-tongue is now being more than ever studied, and you will meet with sojourners in this country far from their Eastern or their Western lands, who have learnt our language, because it is becoming more and more the language of the world. This is something for us to ponder over.

2. And what will be the effect on thoughtful foreigners, on our own children from our Colonial Empire, on our own mechanics and labourers in the fields?

The visitor from India, Japan, and China may marvel at our great engines; but he will tell you, artisans and mechanics, that those beautiful examples of taste and skill were wrought with few tools. He will ask you artisans to showEnglish work with all your English appliances equal to theirs. The truth ought to be said, our English pride may not like to hear it, they beat us out of the field in many things useful and beautiful. The children of old England—who are coming, as we hear, in their thousands from every colony of England—will compare the parents' work with the work of her sons. We cannot produce all that they can show. We may well ask ourselves whether, in view of what they exhibit, we should not feel the necessity of working harder to prevent the children from out-doing the parent.

IV. And when we see the strife that prevails, to get shorter hours and pay equal to longer hours, can the English mechanic and artisan visit these exhibitions, and not come back "a wiser if a sadder man?" seeing how his work is equalled and surpassed by others? I am not afraid to speak before you of "Trade Unionism." You cannot say that I have not thought of all classes in the past. I have in the past declared before you my sense of the good union has done in combining for good and worthy ends. This combination in its present conduct is not to be commended. I do not wish to see "the clock put back" and "Free Trade" abolished. Some more fairness I believe we ought to advocate. A revolution in these matters we do not expect. But much may be done apart from legislation. Go to school again, my friends; let us all go to school in these exhibitions; let them be our schools in which to learn enlarged views. Education is much talked of now. It is failing in its purpose; unless we do more to *educate ourselves*, it will fail to the loss of England. *Education* means tools to work with, not work completed. You are neglecting far too much the end of better instruction. Others, with less education, are using what they have learnt as a help to do better, to compete with and beat the English workmen. We may all of us go to these exhibitions, please our curiosity, gratify our taste; but let us do more, learn where we may learn, and then determine *not to be beaten*.

And thus it may be that these great national events shall yield national benefits.

V. Save up your money to give yourselves healthy pleasure in many ways; but go with a Christian and an Englishman's spirit. If we see much which takes down our pride in handicraft and labour, it will do us good, and make us more humble as Christian men. If our English spirit is roused, good will come of it; but let us see how much we can do to further our country's credit and prosperity. Our country's credit used to stand first and foremost for good work and honest work. Much of our prosperity has gone, because our good work and our honest work is gone. Let us face the truth which others have stated. Sheffield steel was once the first in the field; now, deceptive marks and brands are put on inferior articles. Foreigners have found us out. A city noted for its boot and shoe trade lost it by defrauding Australian miners in the boots exported. These are not recent events; but, alas! the same evil, dishonest ways prevail now, and were common years ago.

England has been famous for good work because it went on a good principle, and that principle was *honesty*.

The foreigner used to ask of goods offered, "Whence come ye?" To come from England was enough. Foreigners now ask us as a nation, "Whence go ye, with your trade quarrels and poorer manufactures?" We have in labour and work to go back to first principles before we attain more prosperity. The first of these principles is the fear of God; and the next follows after, honesty in work and trade. Eastertide, and the lessons it ought to give, should throw light on us, and give help to us in sustaining or regaining the virtues of English character which may be decaying. Few prayers can point to all this better than the Collect for the Third Sunday after Easter.

---

THE Rochester Diocesan Conference is to be held at Wimbledon on the 30th of June and the following day.

## THE LIVING HOPE.

By the Rev. G. JANNINGS, M.A., Rector of Warmsworth, Doncaster.

A Funeral Sermon on the Death of the Rev. Canon Ornsby, M.A., Vicar of Fishlake. Preached at Fishlake, on Easter Sunday, 1886.

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you."—1. St. Peter, i. 3, 4.

WHO could have supposed that these glorious words, with which St. Peter opens his first epistle, would ever have been written by one who once said of this same Jesus, "I do not know the man"? What a transformation! And it was brought about by causes which are a power in the world still. Peter, in a moment of weakness and cowardice, when he had nothing but the resources of poor human nature to rely on, when he thought that the cause of Christ was lost, and when he saw that Jesus Himself was about to fall a victim to the malice of His enemies—Peter then denied his Lord; but no sooner was the cowardly act committed than he was heartily ashamed of it. The look of the dear Lord and Master, whom all the time he loved, softened and subdued him, "and he went out and wept bitterly." And we all know how soon his sorrow was turned into joy—into the joy of forgiveness—the joy of new hope, and enlightened spiritual insight, when, in a short day or two, the Lord's promise was fulfilled. "I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." And this great change in the sentiments, in the character and conduct of the apostle St. Peter, was brought about as I said just now, by influences which are at work in the world still—by the power of the Lord's resurrection—by the power of the Holy Ghost. And the same blessed Spirit who enlightened and transformed the apostle St. Peter, is able (and oh, how willing!) to enlighten and transform us. It is His work "to open our eyes, and to turn us from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God;" that we may receive each one of us, here and now, the forgiveness of sins, and hereafter "an inheritance among all them that are sanctified through faith that is in Jesus." I am quoting, you know, the very words which the Lord Jesus spoke from heaven, to the apostle St. Paul, when He arrested him in his mad career of persecution, and converted him by the mighty power of His grace. And the words are true—they must be true because the Lord Jesus Himself spoke them—the words are true of each one of us. They speak of what we all need, viz., to have our eyes opened, to see the truth as it really is—the truth about ourselves and about God, to see the guilt of sin, and the all-sufficiency of the remedy which God has provided for it, in the atoning death of His dear Son. And the words speak also of an inheritance. Even as the words of St. Peter speak in the text of an inheritance which belongs to us all, by privilege and promise—"an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in Heaven for us."

Our needs are the same as those of the first believers. Our privileges are neither less nor greater than theirs. The difference between us and the apostle who wrote the words of this text is not, I think, due to his having known more than we know, but to his having believed more implicitly and loved more truly. It may be said, indeed, that the apostle knew that the Lord had risen, because he had the evidence of his senses—because he knew for a fact that he was laid a lifeless corpse in the sepulchre, and because he himself had entered that sepulchre, and found that the body of Jesus was no longer there, and had moreover seen Him and conversed with Him after He rose from the dead, and had received from His lips an assurance of forgiveness and restoration to his place among the twelve. Yes, the apostle was convinced by the evidences of the senses, by personal knowledge—by evidence which could not be gainsaid, about which there could be no possibility of misunderstanding or mistake—that the same Jesus who was crucified was really risen from the dead. Nothing short of such a strong conviction of the certainty of the fact of the resurrection could account for the alteration in St. Peter's character; and the subsequent outpouring of the Holy Ghost, according to the Lord's promise, was such a further confirmation of the glorious truth as to make it a positive certainty. So that Peter, in his first discourse to the people, could boldly say, speaking in the name of his brother apostles as well as in his own, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." And this strong assurance, which filled the minds of the twelve honest men (the once doubting Thomas among them) who bore witness of the Lord's resurrection, is a sufficient ground for full assurance of faith on our part also. The chief thing which they knew and were assured of was that "the Lord had risen indeed." They knew no more about the unseen world, nor as to the mode of our future existence, than we do. Even the beloved disciple John, who had such deep spiritual insight, could only say, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." And although the apostles were endued, for a definite and special purpose, with miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, the convincing and converting grace

which they shared is our privilege too. We have as good grounds for our faith as the apostles themselves. The testimony which they bore to the fact of the resurrection, was such as would be held sufficient to establish the credibility of any fact whatever. It has been often and truly said that there is no fact of history which is established on more reliable and trustworthy evidence than the great fact which the Holy Church throughout the world joyfully commemorates to-day. And the Holy Ghost bears witness also, even as He did in the early days of the Gospel. He still enlightens and comforts the hearts of God's faithful people—of those who desire to find and to know the truth—who ask, really wishing to receive.

We may each for ourselves know the power of the Lord's resurrection; we may each, if we desire it, have the witness of the Spirit in our hearts. Although it is over 1800 years since Jesus rose from the dead, lapse of time can make no difference—it cannot alter facts. If Jesus rose then, He lives in our nature now—lives to intercede for us, who are carrying on our warfare here—lives to put forth in us His resurrection power, to apply to our souls, by the ministry of His word and sacraments, "the benefits of His passion" and to make us partakers by His Spirit, of His own Divine nature, and so, in the end, "partakers also of the inheritance of saints in light." And it will be observed that St. Peter, in this text, does not argue about the Lord's resurrection as if it were a matter open to doubt—he thanks God for it. "Blessed be God," he says. He speaks of that which he knew, he gives thanks for a blessing which he had received—his heart was filled with joy in the thought of it—"a joy unspeakable and full of glory," and it was his earnest desire that others might share it with him. What a spirit of triumphant thankfulness and holy joy do the words of the apostle in this text display! Such a change had the lively, *i.e.*, the living, the sure and certain hope of the resurrection, wrought in the apostle's state of mind, that he speaks of himself and his fellow-believers, as having been "begotten again," "born anew." This agrees exactly with the language of St. Paul, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." And truly the difference wrought in the mind of anyone now, by the exchange of a nominal for a real belief, in the truth of Christ's resurrection, may justly be called a new birth, making such an entire change, as it does, in our thoughts, and aims, and hopes.

The hopes which we naturally entertain are bounded by the horizon of this earth, as good Archbishop Leighton says, "They are not living, they are too often lying hopes." They beckon us onward only to deceive us. We set our hearts upon some earthly dream of happiness, and even if we attain the object of our desire, we find, sooner or later, that we have over-estimated its power of giving us pleasure, and, more frequently than not, our most cherished hopes altogether elude us. They often die before us, and we live to bury them, and to perceive our folly and misfortune in trusting to them; but the hope of which the apostle speaks will never fail us, will never disappoint us, except in the happy way of exceeding, in its fruition and fulfilment, our highest expectations; "for eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him."

The inheritance of which we are made heirs through Christ, the apostle says, is "incorruptible"—*i.e.*, imperishable—it will endure for ever; it is "undefiled"—untainted by the consciousness of guilt. We shall be no longer haunted by the remembrance of our former sins; we shall have washed our robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; "it fadeth not away," *i.e.*, its joys will never pall upon the taste, its brightness will never grow dim.

This is the lively hope, the hope full of quickening life, full of immortality, to which we are begotten again by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

And it will be a good test by which to try ourselves, if we inquire whether we can sympathise at all with the feelings of thankful joy expressed in this text; whether we can heartily join the apostle in his "Blessed be God;" whether we can rejoice more than we once did, in the thought of Jesus risen, in the thought of the place that He is gone to prepare, in the thought of the bright inheritance which the apostle says is "reserved in heaven" for us.

Yes, the place is ready: Jesus, by His atoning death, has "opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers." It only remains that we be prepared for the place. It is related of the great Sir Walter Scott that when he was near his end he asked his son-in-law to read to him. His son-in-law said, "What shall I read?" "Do you ask?" said the dying man, "There is but one book." He did not want in that hour to hear words from one of the many books which he himself had written—books which many here have read with pleasure, and which will always delight English-speaking people as long as the world lasts. The fame which he had acquired by his writings could give him no comfort then. There is but one book,—God's book. There is only one Word, the Word of the Lord Jesus, which can give a dying sinner peace. His son-in-law opened the Bible, and read the familiar words of the 14th St. John, "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." When He had finished

Sir Walter said, "Well, that *is* a comfort!" Yes, there is only one thing that can give solid ground of comfort and hope to philosopher or peasant, learned or unlearned, rich or poor. We want to know and be assured that we have a friend in the heavenly places, who is gone before to prepare a place there for us. The risen Lord is there—He is the Friend and the Saviour of us all. He has prepared the place. It is reserved in Heaven for us. It only remains that we be prepared for the place; and there is no business in the world which can compare in importance with this. There is nothing else really worth living for, in this changeful and sorrowful world, except that lively hope, to which we are begotten by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. We have only, like the apostles of old, to believe and to love—to yield ourselves to the sweet constraint of God's Holy Spirit, and to wait patiently His time for the solution of all mysteries, and that lively hope will be ours.

It is a hope which will cheer us amid all the crosses and trials of this mortal life, which will support us in death, and never leave us until it is lost in sight and in the full fruition of the good things which God has promised.

And what else but such a hope can give us consolation when that most acute of all earthly sorrows overtakes us—the loss of those we love. If we know and are assured that they are with Jesus in Paradise, we can more readily resign them at God's bidding—knowing that our loss is their gain. Such will be the great consolation, not only of a beloved household in this parish, but of the parishioners at large, in the sudden and unlooked-for loss of the faithful pastor and friend who has been your guide and counsellor in holy things for five-and-thirty years. And I need not tell any of those here present how faithful and earnest he was in the discharge of all the duties of his sacred office. This immense congregation is itself a testimony to the affectionate respect and esteem in which he was held. It will be many a year—a generation must pass away—ere the memory and the hallowing influence of that upright and consistent life—of that good and holy example—will die out in this parish; and I can well imagine that there are those in this church to-night who will wish now that they had come more frequently to hear, and that they had been more careful to lay to heart, the words of admonition and reproof, of godly counsel and heavenly wisdom, which have been uttered Sunday by Sunday for so many years, by the lips that are now silent in the grave. They will not be opened to speak in audible tones again, but there is a sense in which it may be said, "that he being dead yet speaketh." He will speak often, I am persuaded, to many a heart here in days to come, and not only now, when your sorrow for the great loss which you have all sustained is yet fresh in your minds. He will speak from time to time in your moments of solitude and in your hours of sorrow, by the memory of his kind words of sympathy with you in former troubles, by the recollection of his presence in the chamber of sickness, by the remembrance of his faithful ministrations in this house of God—in this noble church, which he loved so well; and not only has this parish sustained a heavy loss by his lamented decease, but the Church and the diocese as well. He was known far beyond the precincts of his parish by his literary ability and learning. As Dean Cust said in the course of his sermon on Sunday last, in the Cathedral Church of York, of which your late Vicar was an honoured member, "he was not among the least learned of the archæologists of this land—he was one who by his researches had added much to the treasure of those who peer into the records of the past." But he was no less remarkable in life for his piety and humility than for his ability and learning; and if he could speak in my ear at this moment I can well imagine that he would say, "Tell them not of me, but of Him whom I endeavoured to serve in my appointed sphere whilst here on earth, and who is now my exceeding great reward; tell them of Jesus and His love; tell them to give heed betimes to that word of truth which is able to make them wise unto salvation; tell them not to forsake the assembling of themselves together in the church of their baptism and of their fathers; tell them to come to the Lord's table, in obedience to their Saviour's loving command, and to let no unworthy fears and no mistaken notions of fitness or unfitness keep them away." Thus would I speak to you on this sad and solemn occasion, as I feel sure your dear departed pastor and friend would have me speak. And I cannot conclude without reminding you that there are other memories associated with the family of the deceased, which the loss you have just sustained will revive in your minds. It will be in the recollection of many here that 14 years ago you had to mourn the loss of your late Vicar's estimable wife, who by her kindliness and charity had won for herself a place in the hearts of you all, and only last year you followed to the grave your late Vicar's gifted son, whose eloquent words it was always a source of pleasure and profit to you all to hear. They are gone, but only a little while before! We shall all of us soon follow them. Let us not sorrow as those who have no hope, "for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him." Let us rejoice in their happiness, and let us prepare to follow them. Let us learn to rejoice also in the lively hope to which we are begotten by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead—that we may meet again those whom we have loved and lost, no more to be divided; that we may share with them the "inheritance that is incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away."

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1886.

## PREACHING.

(BY A CLERICAL CORRESPONDENT.)

THERE are some who seem to think that the days of preaching are gone by. They appear to be under the impression that it is no longer the power it was, and that its influence is not likely to revive.

There is some foundation for such a feeling in the English Church, because we do not depend, as a rule, so much upon the sermon as we did. There was a time when the sermon was everything, and if the preacher was not an able one, people did not much care to come to church.

*Mais nous avons changé tout cela.* Services have become so elaborate, so attractive, musically and æsthetically, that even a bad preacher can by such aids now fill his church. One consequence, possibly, of this is that clergymen do not take the pains they did with their pulpit discourses. We lament this. With a few brilliant exceptions, it is the case. Let us look the truth in the face, and make the best of it. A man may have a fine presence, a beautiful voice, a pleasant, winning, handsome countenance; he may be a good man of business, popular in his parish, indeed, everything that may be desired, but if he have not carefully thought out his sermon, all is marred. It is just as if a soldier had a blunt sword in his hand. When the critical moment in the battle has come his blow falls powerless, and he is disabled.

But there is something more wanted than mere preparation—mere thinking out of subjects with a view to edification, and rivetting the interest of the audience. This something more is enthusiasm. A God-sent gift. Who can acquire it? We might as well tell a man to acquire patriotism or home affection. No amount of teaching or study will instil this virtue. A man may have every personal disadvantage. He may be small of stature, as probably was St. Paul; he may have as frail and slender a frame as the late beloved Dean Stanley; or he may be big and burly and uncouth—unattractive to a degree. Yet if he have enthusiasm, thousands will hang upon his lips, and flock to hear him whenever his name is announced as the preacher. Intensity of earnestness attracts, impels to what is good and right. The deeply-lined face of Canon Kingsley in Whitehall Chapel is before me as I write. What shall we say of Liddon? He carries us away with his volumes of words and stores of beautiful thoughts. I have never heard Spurgeon, but he attracts thousands whenever he can mount the pulpit steps. Canons Body, Knox Little, Scott Holland, what shall we say of them? Or of Archdeacon Farrar? Or to go across the ocean — of Henry Ward Beecher. Has the modern English pulpit lost its power? When thousands upon thousands, even of the poorer, less instructed classes, can give up time (which is their money), and follow long discourses with breathless interest, without the interruptions and incidents that are allowable in a political gathering. No, it has not lost its power, and never will, as long as man is what he is.

How then can we stir up our English clergy to take more interest in their sermons, to strive to make a grander use of this great weapon which the Almighty has placed in their hands? If we could only realise, all of us, what grand and glorious opportunities we have, and how often they are thrown away—worse than thrown away—I think we should strive more. "A sermon *cold* and *poor* will do more mischief in an hour, than a hundred rich sermons can do good."

What are the dangers in front of us? Are they want of preparation, want of enthusiasm and zeal, want of prayer, want of solitude in this rushing age on the one hand, or of knowledge of social life on the other, when one's life is passed, as is that of so many country clergymen, in one or two small villages? Is it the possession of MS. sermons, which can judiciously be preached over and over again, thus drowning exertion and extinguishing effort? Are our clergy—generally so full of powers of conversation and so entertaining in social life—tongue-tied in the pulpit—the place above all others where their tongues should be loosened and their hearts on fire with the theme of themes? People do not complain about the brevity of the sermons. Was it not Lord Coleridge who said the other day in his legal language, with dry humour, that preachers, in considering the length of their sermons, should "incline to mercy." Words enough we have, somehow or other, whether read or spoken, fresh or stale. But confessedly there is in most preaching a something wanting. What—what is it? "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!" (Num. xi. 29.) These and such-like words are those that at once rise uppermost in our minds. Many, many of our sermons are dull. Many chill the hearts of the hearers, instead of warming them with the fire of love. Why is it, oh, why!

Such a question cannot be answered all in a

breath. There are so many points that have to be considered.

A sermon should be a matter of prayer. Frequently it is not. A sermon should be a matter of preparation. Frequently this preparation is of the most imperfect kind. It should be a matter of enthusiasm. Often there is no enthusiasm in the preacher, and, therefore, none in his hearers. Enthusiasm is like an electric spark, travelling along the wire. A spiritless sermon is like the wire without the electricity; difficult to discover its use, and why it is there. I once went (not so long ago), to the Temple Church on two successive Sundays. Dean Vaughan preached on the first Sunday, Dean Bickersteth on the second. The church was crammed, the choral service exceedingly well performed, the sermons (manuscript ones), well thought out, carefully arranged and clearly delivered. As I walked up Wych Street, Strand, after the second sermon, and observed a small crowd of young men waiting for the opening of a public house, and thought of the comfortable clergy and the fashionable congregation sitting down to their ample luncheons, I could not help remarking to the barrister at my side, "There was a want of enthusiasm in those Temple sermons, they ought to have been extempore." His reply was, "Oh, that would not go down with us lawyers." I subsided, unconvinced. I remember once running seven miles from Barnet to Enfield, years ago, to hear Mr. McClagan (now Bishop of Lichfield) preach. I arrived that dark autumn evening after trotting along that winding, unknown road, breathless, after the second lesson. The church was full, and I gained a last seat just inside the porch door. The preacher mounted the pulpit and gave out his text, St. Luke xii. 23, 24, "Then said one unto Him, Lord, are there few that be saved? And He said unto them, Strive to enter in at the strait gate." Hereupon followed a quiet, simple, extempore discourse, rather under the half-hour, every word of which seemed to go home to that mixed, rapt congregation. A hymn was sung, and all dispersed in reverent silence. Never before or since have I heard a sermon, or witnessed a scene which seemed to me more likely to be productive of a good and lasting impression. Is this the secret of failure—the difference between the extempore and the written sermon? Most people when they are in doubt upon a point of religious procedure, turn to the Book of Books. Certainly this must be on the side of the extempore sermon, for there are so many examples of such, and none of the written. One of the greatest snares in the way of our clergy at the present time, is the manuscript. It destroys freedom, it crushes out enthusiasm, it produces laziness, it deadens all spiritual life, and arouses a feeling of unreality in the hearts of the preacher and his congregation. Fancy John Wesley, with his three sermons a day, preaching from a manuscript. Bishop Barry lost all his MS. sermons the other day in a ship which was sunk in a collision. Probably he is twice the man he would have been had they all arrived safe at Sydney. Would that we could sink a few thousand more old MS. sermons now in the possession of English clergy, still destined to weary the ears of their flocks. Fancy a politician reading a manuscript from a platform, or a member of Parliament from the Opposition bench. All the German clergy laugh at our eccentricity in this respect. Depend upon it, this is our weak point. Well will it be for England and the English Church, if the manuscript ceases to be tolerated. The extempore sermon is the stronghold of Nonconformity, and all our modern mission preachers know they would be powerless if they could not *speak*.

It wants a resolute effort to break away out of the rut of old custom. Many a comfortable layman will tell you he prefers the written sermon. But if it is our object (as it certainly ought to be), to win souls for our Master, we must speak to them in the Master's way. If we want to rouse, to warn, to encourage, to exhort, to turn the sinner from the broad road—if we want to lay out the Gospel in all its fulness, to fill hearts with the love of the Saviour, to persuade, to win, to attract, we must get up fearlessly and speak straight out, mind to mind, mouth to ear, heart to heart. We need not rant, we need not over-excite, but we might as well try to boil our kettle without fire, as attempt to warm the hearts of men with the dear love of Jesus by means of the manuscript sermon.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### SELF-DENIAL.

SIR,—There is, to my mind at least, much erroneous teaching on the subject of self-denial, and so I cannot do otherwise than thank Mr. Brigstocke for giving me another opportunity of writing about it.

He quotes my definition of self-denial as it is generally understood — "denying to oneself little pleasures." I said that, according to Scripture teaching, this was no virtue. I gave my reason—in duty, to be virtuous, there must be the element of pleasure. But where the element of pleasure is, there the element of self-denial cannot be. This is my position, correctly stated. If it can be set aside, let who will try. I shall be glad to be shown when I am in error. Mr. Brigstocke, if he will allow me to say so, has not succeeded, and this we shall now see.

The passage from Romans is of easy explanation. The Apostle had been treating of eating. He shows that as an ethical question *per se*, it was indifferent what a man ate. But as regarded others, the question was important. No man must cause his brother to offend. He ought not to use his liberty in

this respect, but consider his weaker brother. The duty, then, is clear. Now as to the way he should discharge it — grudgingly? willingly? If, with a feeling of self-denial, then it would be grudgingly; but if with one of pleasure, then it would be willingly. So we come round to my position, which, on examination, will be found to be quite Scriptural. The same explanation may be given of the reference to the Saviour. But, N.B., such expressions, "No man taketh it from me, I lay it down of myself." "I delight to do thy will, O God."

Permit an illustration: I have just come off a journey. I alight at the station. I have some distance yet to go before I reach my destination—a friend's house. There are a number of cabs standing about. My first impression is to jump into one and drive off. But just then the thought comes into my mind, If I walk, I shall save a shilling, and so shall be able to assist some poor body! I walk, therefore, and give away my shilling. Now the ethical point is, whether I had more pleasure in taking the alternative? The answer is brief—I had. I pleased myself [my better nature], I did not deny myself [my baser nature]. I do not think that it [my baser nature] has any claim to be heard. Self-denial has no place with me.

Mr. Brigstocke's reference to Luke ix. 23, is very unhappy. That certainly does not favour the generally received view of self-denial. Let us remind ourselves of the Saviour's own words—*ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν*—and we shall see this. We have here the accusative case, and we want the dative. The dative is rigidly excluded. This is general. Is it also accidental?

I hope Mr. Brigstocke will now see that what he calls "new theology" is very old. The other view is the new one, and it is not better. If he will examine the new view a little more he will find the explanation of it very easy—it is human nature. We like to think we have merited something. We should rather say, when we have done all:—"I am an unprofitable servant; I have done nothing more than it was my duty to do!

J. P. SANDLANDS,
Brigstock Vicarage, May 29th, 1886.

---

SIR,—Your correspondents, in discussing this subject, seem to take Luke ix. 23, as being nothing more than a precept to deny oneself certain pleasures or indulgences, for the sake of self-discipline, or for the benefit of others.

This is a popular idea of the passage, but surely far from reaching the fulness of its meaning.

To "deny Christ" is to refuse Him our allegiance, our fealty; to say that He is not our Lord, our Leader, our King. To deny ourselves is to surrender the claim to be our own, to have the right over ourselves, to be free to do as we please. When we deny ourselves and confess Christ, we declare ourselves to be His men—to use the old feudal phrase; we take His yoke upon us, we follow His leading, we bow before His law. The essence of Christian self-denial is the substitution of Christ's will for our own will, of Christ's rule over us for our rule over ourselves. What kind or degree of renunciation of pleasures and indulgences that submission to Christ may require is another question, to be determined by circumstances. Self-surrender to Christ is the principle; the outward acts it may entail are the special particulars flowing from it. The former is the evangelical denial of self; the latter are its consequences when it is translated into conduct.

PRESBYTER.

---

## MIRACLES AND THE LAWS OF NATURE.

SIR,—In Professor Bonney's sermon on "Miracles and the Laws of Nature," reported in the PULPIT of 22nd May, I read the following:—"I do not admit the term miracle to mean anything more than the operation of a law, but not of the law with which we are familiar."

This idea is not new, and I do not think it is true. If it were true—if, to use an illustration of the Professor's in the same sermon, a miracle were related to common phenomena only as the blossoming of an aloe once in a hundred years is related to the lives of insects which live for only a small part of a year—what evidential value would it have at all? Laws of nature manifested but seldom do not prove God any better than laws of nature manifested every day. Miracles are not results of any laws of nature, neither are they contrary thereto.

> But here is the finger of God, a flash of the will that can,
> Existent behind all laws, that made them, and lo, they are!
> (Browning's "Abt. Vogler.")

The function of miracle is to show that though natural law is co-extensive with the Universe, it is not all-powerful in the Universe; but that such law is the expression of a Divine will, which can reveal itself by setting law for the moment aside, and producing effects independently of it.

If it is said that miracles are intended to reveal the laws of the Divine nature, this is perfectly true, but nothing but confusion worse confounded can arise from confounding the laws of the Divine nature with the created laws of mere physical nature, such as the law of gravitation.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.
Belfast, May 31, 1886.

---

## FREE TRADE.

SIR,—As your esteemed correspondent asks me two or three questions, I am in a certain manner obliged to write the present, although I had hoped that my last might have closed this series of letters.

I am at present living in an agricultural district, in which the farmers pay their rents, and are fairly prosperous. I am prepared to learn from your correspondent that he does not believe me; I humbly think, however, that I am a better authority concerning the state of this country than one who does not know it. The same concerning the prosperity of some trades that I spoke of. What may be meant by saying that my description of one manufacture as being of two millions sterling of annual amount, and of another manufacture as able to afford very handsome wages, shows that those trades are in a bad condition, I cannot even conjecture.

A condition of perfect and universal Free Trade is practicable through the universal abolition of all indirect taxes. This is a thing that does not admit of discussion. Whether such abolition would be expedient may admit of discussion. If your correspondent should say that the abolition of indirect taxes would necessitate direct taxes to the same

amount as the indirect taxes abolished, and that therefore the abolition is impracticable, he is right with the exception of the "therefore."

If, when I am asked to propound the principle which explains all our ills, it be intended to ask me for an explanation of the mode in which the reduced production of gold acts upon prices in general, and if I am tied down to putting my explanation tersely, I am able to say no more than that when the demand for an article of commerce falls off, the supply remaining the same, the price obtainable for the article will diminish. I hope this is terse enough. I do not expect, for all that, that its value will be appreciated by everybody. There is hardly a more tersely-expressed principle ever uttered, than that which states the rule of the variation of speed of planets in their revolutions round the sun:—"Equal areas in equal times"; yet this rule, so simple and so evident when its demonstration is understood, conveys absolutely no meaning to one unacquainted with conic sections. It is like the apprehension of the truths of economic science, which science is not exactly "the common affairs of everyday life." Mr. Sandlands says he is a practical man; in saying which I suppose he means something, I cannot imagine what. A practical mathematician must know the elements of Euclid; and a practical economist must know Adam Smith.

B.

May 31st, 1886.

## Reviews and Notices.

"The Monthly Interpreter." June, 1886. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

It is said that there are 450 explanations of that supremely difficult text, Gal. iii. 20. In a very interesting paper on St. Paul's view of the unity of God, the Rev. J. Barmby gives us (not, however, entirely as his own) yet another; and, we are bound to add, a very interesting one. We cannot extract three pages, but we give as much as we can of the conclusion "A mediator is not of one" (*i.e.* "of *that which is* one"—whether singly or collectively—mediation has no place where there is unity), "but God is one" (in the sense [qualitative sense], with all that follows from it, ever present to St. Paul's mind when he says, εἷς ὁ θεός); therefore (the conclusion follows though not expressed) the law with its intervening mediator, did not manifest God's unity, and the consequent unity of all in Him." It may, however, be replied that the law taught the unity of God, even if it did not manifest it, and taught it, too, very forcibly. Mr. Barmby's paper is very able, but he has not finally settled the interpretation of this difficult text.

Dr. Paton Gloag, writing on "Peter's Residence in Rome," thus sums up:—"It would appear that the Biblical evidence is against Peter's residence in Rome as an historical fact, whilst the patristic tradition is in favour of it. It is true that the Biblical evidence is chiefly of a negative character, but it is so strong as to preclude the residence of Peter in Rome in those very years to which the tradition assigns it. The testimony of the Fathers, on the other hand, is positive; but it is remote from the time of the facts to which it relates." Now an ounce of positive evidence is worth a pound of negative; is it not most probable that the Fathers were right in the general statement (that St. Peter was at Rome), but wrong in their particulars—*i.e.*, as to time, etc.?

We are sorry we have only space to mention Dr. Whitelaw's seventh paper on "The Patriarchal Times"; Mr. Deane's fourth paper on "The Difficulties of Scripture"; and one by Dr. Matheson on "The Promise of Revelation."

"Man's Knowledge of God." By Richard Acland Armstrong B.A. Modern Handbooks of Religion. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.

If all the other Handbooks of Religion are as ably written as this one, the Rev. Henry McKean, their editor, is doing an incalculable service, not only to religion, but also to science. We say to science, because all the descriptions, aims, and scopes, of the different physical sciences alluded to in this book are accurately given. The great and orderly Drama of Nature is proved to be the necessary work of one Almighty Will, and the sources of man's knowledge of this Will are carefully detailed as witnessed to by the understanding, the conscience, and the spirit (heart). In closing this admirable little book, the author is fully justified in writing:—

> In discussing Man's Knowledge of God, I have discussed all that seems to me fundamental in religion. This sense of the divine presence and this conscious communion with God seem to me to be the sum and substance of all the highest and purest religion, and of Christian religion in particular. Such seems to me to be exactly the religion which Jesus taught, and just what he longed that all the world should feel. Thus, for my part, I should have no inclination to press upon religious inquirers any elaborate system of doctrine outside this simple Knowledge of God. And so all the great words of Christian doctrine, around which the warfare of the Churches has raged, seem to me to fall into their true place at once as they are related to this one supreme faith. Salvation, for example, I take to be simply the winning of a human soul into this happy and beautiful Knowledge of God. Heaven I take to be such a life as they enjoy in whom this knowledge is fullest and deepest; Hell, the life of those who stand in outer darkness, rebels against conscience, and unblessed by any divine communion. Forgiveness is the passing away of the clouds that hide God from the heart. Faith, by which we are saved indeed, is loyalty to the utterances of the divine voice in the soul. Revelation is the unveiling of the knowledge to those who were blind to it, and Inspiration is the inbreathing of that spirit into a man's soul, by which he is made quick and strong to apprehend the truth.

"Sermons by Mark Pattison." London: Macmillan & Co. Pp. 298.

This is a volume of sermons, which, we are told have never appeared in print in an authoritative form, and which were preached before the University of Oxford, during the ten years from 1861 to 1871; the reason of their publication being, that it was thought that they would be of interest to the readers of the recently published memoirs, as illustrating the views of the writer during the earlier period of his life.

They are eminently "University" sermons, and deal largely with the special work of the University as the place for training the minds of men, and, doubtless, were appreciated by those who heard them, but beyond this, there is not very much that the ordinary parochial clergyman will gain from them in the way of preparation of sermons, excepting the choice of words, and the logical treatment of the subject.

The first sermon is on the great Commandment, and is based on St. Matthew, xxii. 37-40, in which it

would seem to be the preacher's object to prove, what the Seventh Article clearly states, viz., that the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, and he says also that:—

With respect to the whole moral teaching of the Gospel, to enable us to estimate it aright, two opposite characteristics which it possesses, must be embraced in our mind. It possesses at once novelty and antiquity. The ethics of Christianity are, at once, the same as, and different from, the ethics of the Old Testament. It is from dwelling on one of these characteristics of them, to the exclusion of the other, that erroneous views of the relation of the New to the Old Covenant have appeared and are, from time to time, reappearing in Christendom.

And he goes on to show how that, when the Gospel history comes to be critically examined, every idea whether of morals or religion, may be traced to the older Scriptures. The points are worked out with great lucidity and clearness.

The second sermon is based on 1 Cor. xiii. 8, but we could wish that there were more examination and exegesis of the text, instead of its being only incidentally referred to; in this sermon he speaks at length on the work of the University, and also speaks of the Christian system, thus:—

Christianity offers an object to the pure reason—its theology, its doctrine of the nature of God. Christianity as a system of religion comprises a theology; but the theology is not put forward as the essential part of the religion. Christianity is by nothing so much distinguished from the other religions known to us' as by laying its whole weight on morality. We are to be saved by a faith, but it is only such a faith as is fruitful in good works. Not to know, but to do, the will of God is its repeated inculcation. Compared with the more philosophical religions on the one hand, and with the more sensualistic and material popular religions on the other, this, its distinctive ethical character, will stand out in a clear light. Christianity is a system of practical ethics.

The third sermon is based on the text 2 Cor. xii. 14. "The children ought not to lay up for the parents, &c.," in which he further discusses at length the subject of University education and training, and in it we find the following statement, which we believe, is, to a certain extent, perfectly true, that:—

However thankful we in this country must be for the religious blessings which the Reformation movement brought to us, it will not be denied that its immediate effect on the Universities was most disastrous.

So, also, in another sermon, he truly states:—

Scarcely any sentiment of the Reformation has sunk deeper into the mind of this country, than its aversion to monkery. Yet monkish virtue is still more alien to the spirit of a pure Christianity.

He also gives a note of warning. As, for instance, when he says that:—

Ascetic piety is not so much forgotten as condemned for unevangelical. In rejecting the monastic institute, which is the caricature of religion, *we need to be careful lest we let slip the reality with it.* [The italics are our own.] Ascetic piety is one thing, mortification of the flesh is another.

The writer gloried in the fact that the Church of England possessed the schools and the universities, and says:—

May she never forfeit them. May she never take the fatal step of standing upon authority instead of upon pure reason, upon intellect, upon education, upon the spiritual and moral cultivation of the soul.

Yet what do we see? Tests abolished, a godless religion set up, the Bible, in some places, banished, by professedly Christian men, from Board Schools, or if read, no note or comment allowed — to say nothing of the fact that the burden is thrown upon the rates of keeping up such schools.

There is much that is interesting in these sermons, and the volume may well find a place in a clergyman's study, and those who have committed to them the care of the young, will find much help from a careful perusal of these sermons.

---

It has been stated that the vicarage of Leeds was accepted by the Rev. F. J. Jayne, Principal of Lampeter, but the announcement is said to have been premature.

The Rev. J. S. Purton, rector of Chetton, having resigned the examining chaplaincy to the Bishop of Worcester, which he has held during the present Episcopate, the Bishop has requested Canons Melville and Creighton to undertake the duties after the ensuing June ordination.

On Wednesday, the 26th ult., at the morning service, the Rev. Philip F. Eliot, of Trinity College, Oxford, vicar of Holy Trinity, Bournemouth, and Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral, was installed into the canonry lately vacated at Windsor by the death of Lord Wriothesley Russell.

It is the Rev. Arthur Symonds, vicar of Poulton, near Fairford, Gloucestershire, who has been appointed rector of St. Thomas's, Stockport. The Rev. W. Symonds, his half-brother, was already rector of St. Mary's, Stockport. Mr. Arthur Symonds was ordained in 1880, and the patroness was his mother.

On Saturday, the 29th ult., the Archbishop of Canterbury and Mrs. Benson entertained at Lambeth the Archbishop of York and Mrs. Thomson and Miss Thomson, Lord and Lady Balfour of Burleigh, Sir Michael and Lady Lucy Hicks-Beach, Sir John and Lady Mowbray, Mr. W. H. and Mrs. Smith and Miss Smith, Sir John and Lady Fowler, Mr. and Mrs. Cecil Raikes, Sir John Hanham, Canon and Mrs. Furse, and Mr. Arthur Gray.

At the Chester Consistory Court on Thursday an application was made by the vicar (the Rev. W. C. Martin) and the churchwardens of All Saints' parish, Marthall, near Knutsford, for power to build a new chancel, vestry, and organ-chamber, to refix the pulpit, and make other structural alterations, and generally restore the fabric. The accommodation (it was stated) would be increased by some twenty-nine sittings by the proposed alterations, the cost of which, amounting to £500, it was understood would be defrayed by Lord Egerton, of Tatton. Chancellor Espin granted the faculty applied for.

On Saturday, the 29th ult., by permission of the Bishop of London and Mrs. Temple, an exhibition of trades and factory work, exhibited by girls from East London, was held at London House. There was a very large attendance of the nobility, St. James's Square being completely lined with carriages. The immediate object of the meeting and exhibition was to enlist the sympathy of the ladies of the West End with the condition of the toiling girls and women of the East. Hence there were specimens of almost every kind of trade and factory work performed by girls and women, the time taken to produce, and the payments made for their production.

A license was recently granted by a surrogate in the suburbs of Birmingham, for a marriage to take place in a neighbouring Staffordshire parish, and it was intended that the hour asked for should be ex

tended in the afternoon, as sanctioned by the statute which came into operation on the 18th of May; but the license was filled up with the hours customary before the new Act was passed—namely, from eight till twelve. This being inconvenient to the parties, and there being no time to wait for a new licence, an appeal was made for an alteration of the licence granted, to which the Bishop has sent the following reply:—"Diocesan Registry, Lichfield, May 29th, 1886. —Marriage Hours Extension.—Dear Sir,—The Bishop does not propose altering the hours in the marriage licenses until the canon law is altered by Convocation, so as to bring it into harmony with the statute laws.—Yours faithfully, Herbert C. Hodson."

Dr. Cheyne, the successor of Bishop Wordsworth as Oriel Professor of the Exegesis of Holy Scripture, at Oxford, delivered, on the 28th ult., the second, and more noteworthy, portion of his inaugural lecture, on "Heinrich Ewald, his Life and Works." In selecting Ewald as the subject of his inaugural lecture, the new Professor clearly intended to emphasise the fact that it is as a pupil and follower of Ewald that he proposes to carry on his work. The peculiar and original feature of Ewald's genius was, he contended, this—that Ewald, in all his critical researches, amid all the freedom of his speculation, never lost his hold, would never suffer himself to lose his hold, on his fundamental and underlying faith. Merely negative criticism was entirely abhorrent to him; and in his own reconstructive efforts he could never forget that the New Testament was the key to and the crowning point of the Old. To the school of Bauer and of Strauss he stood from the first diametrically opposed; and, though it would be untrue to say that the writings of Bauer and of Strauss were the occasion of his great work, he had conceived and designed it before their works appeared; yet his antagonism to the negative results which their writings embodied gave in many ways a direction to the course of his studies and the character of his writings. His History of Israel is, and was designed to be, conservative, not revolutionary, a buttress to Christian belief, not an attack upon it. The weak side of Ewald's genius was his incapacity to co-operate with others; even his purely philological conclusions would have been more permanent and successful had he been willing to use the results at which others had arrived, and to take advantage of the corrections and criticisms which combined labour is sure to supply. To such restraints his genius and temper did not for the most part allow him to submit; yet, though by this cause partially crippled, the work he has left behind him must be pronounced immortal; while the spirit in which he worked should surely find an echo in England, the country which produced Bishop Lowth, the founder and pioneer of those studies which, though neglected and held cheap here, fired a flame in Germany that has not yet burnt out.

May Festival at Westow.—The fifth of these old English children's festivals, was held recently at Westow. The procession formed in the school yard, and comprised the May Queen, maids of honour, Robin Hood, and his merry men, Little John, knights, beefeaters, esquires, flower-girls, &c., in suitable costumes; and various characters from nursery stories, and old May-Day pageantries. Sixteen boys from Mr. Midgley's School, Westow Hall, dressed in various coloured dresses, wreathed the Maypole. The May Queen, (Eva Crosby a little village maiden of about eleven), accompanied by her court, ascended her throne, where she was crowned with a beautiful floral diadem by Miss Josephine M. Terry, daughter of the Lord Mayor of York. The National Anthem and various glees and kindergarten gesture songs followed. The Lady Mayoress of York presented to the Queen of the May a silver brooch in commemoration of the day. After votes of thanks to the Lady Mayoress, &c., and a few words from the vicar, the proceedings closed with the National Anthem.

On Saturday, the 29th ult., at Yarmouth the new mission smack "Euston," given to the Mission to Deep Sea Fishermen by the Duchess of Grafton, was dedicated for its work in the Lowestoft fleets in the presence of a large number of ladies and gentlemen. After the ceremony, Mr. E. J. Mather, the secretary, gave a brief description of the objects of the Mission, and read letters from the Bishop of London, from Mr. Taylor of the Board of Trade, and from Mr. S. Hoare, M.P. The Duke of Grafton (of whose brother the smack is intended to be a memorial) expressed his satisfaction that through the instrumentality of the Mission, the floating grog-shops or Dutch copers had now been very nearly banished from the North Sea. His Grace read a kindly letter from his sister-in-law the Duchess of Grafton, addressed to the men of the Lowestoft division of the deep sea fishing fleet, in which she urged them to trust to the skipper of this new Mission smack; to look upon him as their natural ally, and to avoid their enemy the coper. Sir Edward Birkbeck, M.P., also addressed the meeting, and suggested the formation of a fund for the relief of the widows and orphans of those men who may lose their lives while out with the Mission smacks. The suggestion met with approval, and the Duke of Grafton at once offered £50 as a nucleus of the fund proposed. The Mayor afterwards entertained a large party of ladies and gentlemen at luncheon.

A few months ago the Rev. W. Tuckwell, rector of Stockton, decided to let out the greater part of the glebe lands of his parish in one-acre allotments. The scheme was eagerly taken up by the labourers. The rents were fixed, the draft rules made out, and numerous applications received to rent the land. It was, however, felt, both by Mr. Tuckwell and the labourers, and for the establishment of an allotment estate on a satisfactory basis "fixity of tenure" was an absolute necessity. The only method by which this could be secured was by an Act of Parliament known as the Ecclesiastical Leases Act, 1843. Under this Act the incumbent of a living is able to let the greater portion of his glebe land on farming leases for a term of fourteen years; but these leases are subject by the Act to a great many restrictions, and the consent of the patron of the living and the Bishop of the diocese is absolutely necessary to them. A model lease was drafted by Mr. Vince, of Birmingham, solicitor to the Allotments Association, and was submitted to the patrons of the living, the fellows of New College, Oxford, and at once received their assent. The Bishop of Worcester was then applied to as Diocesan, to give his assent to the arrangement, but his lordship, seemingly upon legal grounds, declined to do so. A petition, signed by a committee of seventy-two labouring tenants, in which it was pointed out that the rent was "reasonable," and higher than had been paid for any portion of the glebe for the last three years, and thus while benefitting the living it would confer a boon of the highest value upon them as labourers, was then

addressed to the Bishop, and Mr. Tuckwell also wrote very strongly and earnestly to the Bishop, urging the claims of the labourers, and expressing the opinion that the refusal to grant leases would alienate them from the Church, and embitter their relations with future incumbents of the parish. The Bishop has finally disposed of the project by declining to give his sanction. His lordship says :—

"I think that the Act of 5 and 6 Victoria cannot be made to apply to them without undue straining of its provisions. I am confirmed in this opinion by the legal advice that I have sought. But, assuming that a competent court of law would hold such leases to be valid, I am met by the further difficulty that I doubt very much the success of the experiment which you wish to try in the interests of either landlord or tenants. I think it my duty not to impose these leases on the benefice for a fixed period until further experience has shown that the experiment may be made with safety. I do not think it necessary to take any further notice of your taunts, which I feel to be uncalled for and unjust, than to assert that I yield to no man in my desire to improve the status and well-being of those who, either in town or country, earn their living by manual labour."

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alford, Rev. Clement, M.A., Curate ; Vicar of Westbury-sub-Mendip.
Barber, Rev. Edward, M.A., Archdeacon of Chesser and Rector of St. Bridget with St. Martin, Chester.
Billett, Bev. Frederick, Curate of Holy Trinity, Bristol ; Vicar of the new district of Christ Church, Barton Hill, Bristol.
Cranstoun, Rev. John Pugh, M.A., Chaplain of Foxe's Charity, Ludlow.
Ellis, Rev. Robert James, M.A., Rector of Kirkby Knowle ; Rector of Skelton in Cleveland.
Farmer, Rev. W. S., Curate ; Vicar of Saltney, Chester.
Feilden, Rev. Henry Arbuthnot, Vicar of Kirkby Stephen.
Horton, Rev. Le Gendre G., Curate of Bilton, near Rugby ; Vicar of Wellow, near Bath.
Jalland, Rev. Alfred Ernest, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Woolley.
Knox, Rev. Charles Beresford, M.A., Vicar of Lower Beeding.
Lawrence, Rev. T. R., Vicar of North Bow ; Superintendent of the Soldiers' Institute at Alexandria.
Lawton, Rev. John Thomas, M.A., Curate ; Perpetual Curate of St. Thomas, Bedford, Manchester.
Lewis, Rev. George A., M,A., Senior Curate of Croydon ; Vicar of Headcorn, Kent,
Mitchell, Rev. J., Vicar of Alberbury, Salop ; Rector of Barford St. Martin, near Salisbury.
Piddocke, Rev. Morris, M.A., Vicar of Kirknewton.
Pratt, Rev. H. Madan, Rector of Great Witcombe, near Gloucester ; Rector of Sherborne with Windrush.
Scott, Rev. Joseph Downs, Vicar of Hopton Cangeford and Rector of Coldweston.
Shelford, Rev. L. E., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Upper Clapton, and Honorary Chaplain to the Bishop of Bedford ; Rector of Stoke Newington.
Smith, Rev. Charles Fullerton, M.A., Vicar of Lund, Preston.
Symonds, Rev. Arthur, Vicar of Poulton, near Fairford, Gloucestershire ; Rector of St. Thomas's, Stockport.
Thorne, Rev. Henry Arthur, formerly Curate of Birchington ; Vicar of Steeple, near Maldon, Essex.
Turner, Rev. David, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Guilden Sutton.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Coyte, Rev. James, for more than forty-five years Rector of Polstead, at Polstead Rectory, on the 28th ult., aged 90.
Marshall, Rev. Edward, at Kirton, near Boston, on the 29th ult., aged 67.
Stokes, Rev. Louis, at 3, Park Hill, Richmond, on the 23rd ult., aged 33.
Whitehouse, Rev. Ernest Frederick, for twenty-eight years Vicar of Holy Epiphany, Lache-cum-Saltney, and formerly of Dudley, at Saltney Vicarage, near Chester, on the 26th ult., aged 76.


## TIMELY ADVICE.

As the brighter, warmer weather takes the place of biting frosts, keen winds, and damp mists, a large number of persons will eagerly anticipate with the advent of summer some amelioration of their ailments, which during winter months prove more or less distressing. It is well known that there are thousands who go on in this way year after year, every twelve months being divided, so to speak, into two seasons, one of suffering, the other of slight relief from a "durance vile," rendered imperative by their unfitness to encounter, to say nothing of enjoy, anything but the balmiest weather. Of course there are many people who can get over this difficulty by wintering abroad, but these are comparatively few, and by far the largest percentage of such sufferers are compelled to drag on through the colder months of the year with a series of days dull with suffering and confinement indoors, the warmer ones clouded more or less by a lurking dread of the succeeding winter.

We have endeavoured to show from time to time how the human system may of itself be enabled to overcome climatic influences by the restoration of dormant forces to activity, but those sufferers who should be most interested in this fact are apt to mistake the time at which remedial measures should be applied. When the trying season comes they are very ready and anxious to do anything to get help, but is is not so easy when the dull pall of winter has settled upon them. At that time the protective forces of the system are strained to the uttermost in a natural endeavour to carry out their functions with integrity, and this can scarcely be maintained even with the constant use of artificial aids and other remedial measures. These cannot do more than check the rapid degeneration which must follow this strain continued year after year. On the other hand, a more favourable season (*i.e.*, warmer weather) relaxes the strain upon the recuperative forces, and they are enabled to work more efficiently, and fulfil to a greater degree the offices for which they were designed. Then is the time to seek to strengthen them. The influences which before could only stay the waste or prevent a collapse, have a chance to exert a bracing effect upon the constitution, storing up a reserve of energy that may be brought into play when the season at which greater demand is made returns again.

It will not be difficult for anyone to gather from this view, which is surely logical, that if Odo-Magnetic Treatment can do so much for sufferers of the class to which we have referred during the most trying season of the year, it has far greater scope if adopted, while external conditions do not necessitate any special exercise of the weak forces. The improvement in health from this natural energiser, aided by more favourable weather, is augmented and more permanently established from day to day, as long as the application of the remedy is continued.

This is simplicity itself, and its simplicity must be a powerful argument in favour of Odo-Magnetic Treatment, for the more simple the remedy, and the more closely it is allied to the healing processes of nature, the more speedy and permanent will be the effect produced. A remedy of this character is so simple that it may be in operation without the knowledge of the sufferer, and may only be revealed by the conscious increase of strength, and an inclination for, and actual delight in, the duties of life.

It will be regarded as a pleasure by Mr. B. C. Garratt to do anything to extend the knowledge of this subject, and to afford any desired information. His advice may be had gratuitously, by personal application or by letter, and those whose sufferings have become chronic through the failure of ordinary remedies are, if possible, more especially welcome to his attention. A thoughtfully candid opinion may always be anticipated, with the fullest consideration of all necessities and varying features of the case submitted. B. COPSON GARRATT, 16, Finsbury Square, London, E.C.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## NECESSITY OF BELIEF.

By the Lord Bishop of PETERBOROUGH.

Sermon Preached in Peterborough Cathedral, on Sunday, March 28th, 1886.

"God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." —2 Thess. ii. 13.

WE have seen already that the kingdom of God on earth—His Holy Catholic Church—is a visible kingdom into which we are admitted by the outward and visible sign of baptism, and we have seen that those who enter into that kingdom, by doing so enter into covenant relations with God, who is the King of it—that He, on His part, promises us something in that kingdom, and that we, on our part, promise Him something. His promise to us, as we have seen, is salvation—God has chosen us for this—that we should enter into His kingdom, and therein be saved. And, therefore, we speak of that kingdom as a state of salvation in which men are being saved by God according to His promise and covenant, and, on the other hand, we promise and vow to God something in order to gain this salvation, and we have seen, we promise Him three things, that our covenant is one of renunciation, of faith, and of obedience—we promise to renounce the kingdom of darkness and all its works, to believe the articles of the Christian Faith, and to obey His holy will and His commandments. Now, as to the first and last promises, the promise of renunciation and the promise of obedience, every one can see that they are only just and reasonable, and whatever difficulty there is in understanding them there is no difficulty in understanding the grounds and reasons for them, it is only fitting that when we enter the kingdom of God we should forsake and renounce that kingdom hostile to and in rebellion to God. If we enter one kingdom we should leave the other, just as a Frenchman desiring to become an English subject, or an Englishman a French subject, must leave his nationality behind him. As he enters into the other kingdom a Frenchman's citizenship in his country would cease, and as an Englishman leaving England would cease to be an English citizen, so we cease to be citizens of the kingdom of the devil in order that we may be citizens of the kingdom of God. It is only just and reasonable that they who enter into the kingdom of God should obey the laws of that kingdom, and, therefore, the vow of obedience is intelligible and reasonable; but it is not quite so clear, it is not, in the first instance, so reasonable that we should be bound to the second of these vows—that we are to believe all the articles of the Christian Faith. We do not at first see the reason in believing in a certain set of dogmas or facts: we do not see the reasonableness in making belief in these a condition to salvation. It is not an uncommon thing for men to say—probably some of you have heard it said—we can understand that a man must be well conducted, holy, moral even, in order that he may be saved; but why should he believe, in order to be saved, in certain doctrines, in certain creeds—are we to be told that God will punish a man because he has not believed in certain dogmas or doctrines—will our belief in dogma, in religion, in fact, be made a condition of eternal salvation? Now, it is just and right we should give full weight to this objection, and if we are to say of the Creed God has arbitrarily, and, from His own will and choice only, attached a penalty to disbelief in these dogmas and these facts, and He will destroy man hereafter if he makes a mistake in his belief, because He chooses to do it; it would be hard to defend such a doctrine as this. But that is not why we say that Christian belief is necessary to salvation, and there is a very different reason for it, and a very sufficient reason—let us try to understand it. Is it the case that salvation is made to depend upon opinion only in the Church and in the Creeds, or is it the case that salvation—deliverance from very serious evil, deliverance from loss, and even, perhaps, from death itself—does actually depend upon an opinion and belief in many other opinions besides the Creeds? Why, my dear friends, it is the commonest thing in the world to find salvation depends upon opinion, that life actually and deliverance from death may depend on a man's opinions. What is the case with every one of us in this world? We are surrounded by facts, by great material laws, in this world, on the knowledge of which, on the recognition of which, our life in this world, our success, our happiness, our health or disease, depend, and if any man makes a mistake about those facts he suffers accordingly—probably he may suffer a great loss, or he may suffer death. Let a man have an opinion that water will not drown or fire will not burn, and the consequence of his mistake about those facts may be that he will be burnt or drowned. Let a man make a mistake as to facts which concern his health. Let him think that is wholesome which is poisonous, and the result of his mistake in his belief will be that he will die of poison. Let a man make a mistake in his worldly affairs—let him suppose that he is conducting his business rightly when he is conducting it wrongly—and the result will be that he will be ruined. In all these cases, and a hundred others you may imagine, a man's preservation through life from loss, from

suffering, it may be from death, depends on his rightly believing about certain facts. And when a doctor or a man of science, or a man of business, tells you if you make a mistake about those facts you will suffer, you do not call him a bigot, or say that he is interfering with the right of free thought, or fettering the freedom of your mind, because he gives you his "creed" about facts that concern you materially. Well, then, you see that it is clear that so far from belief as a condition to salvation being confined to things spiritual and to the Creeds of the Church, it exists everywhere, wherever man comes in contact with those facts and those laws. A man may hold himself very free—and he is free—to think as he pleases about facts and laws; but if he thinks amiss the facts and the laws will revenge themselves upon him for his mistaken free thought. Now, that is all we say about the Creeds of the Church. We do not say the Lord has arbitrarily attached a penalty to his misbelief or a reward for his belief, but that these things come naturally, in the course of natural result, just as they do in those other things of which I have been speaking. We do not say—Believe and you will be rewarded by going to Heaven—misbelieve or disbelieve, and you shall go to Hell; we say this—Heaven and Hell, the states of happiness or misery, are the outcome of man's conduct with respect to certain facts and certain laws, and if he does not recognise those facts, and conform to those laws, he must suffer—that is what we say. What are the Creeds of the Church? They mostly deal with facts. Read the Creed you have just recited, and see how it deals with the facts of Christ's existence and birth, and incarnation, and death, and resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Spirit—all these are facts, and men, if they know these facts, or have these facts revealed to them, are as much bound to give heed to these facts as to any others. Are we to be told that it is vital and essential for man to believe in the facts of this world which God has made, and that it is a matter of no consequence whatever whether he thinks rightly or wrongly about God, who created him and the world? If there be a God He is a fact—a fact of all facts, a great eternal fact, a fact which underlies all others, and on which all others depend, and it is absurd to say—You must think rightly about the facts of the universe, but it is of no consequence whatever whether you think rightly or wrongly of the God of the universe. God is a fact, Christ is a fact, the soul is a fact, sin is a fact, eternal life is a fact, eternal death is a fact, and the creeds tell you so, and tell you to think rightly about those things. And when a man talks to you about the Creeds as fetters upon free thought, he is talking absurdly and illogically. It is not a question of free thought whether a man should or should not believe the Creed, it is a question of wisdom, of prudence, whether he will or will not wisely believe what is true, and wisely conform himself to facts, eternal facts; and the penalty that falls on disbelief is the natural consequence of man trying to set himself against the facts and against the laws of the spiritual world, which are as much facts, and as truly laws, as the facts and laws of the natural world. Let us have done, then, once for all, with this mere cant—for it is nothing but cant—of free thought, and "the fetters of the Creed." How does it come that the man who thinks, who *thinks* there is no God is any freer in his thinking than the man who believes there is a God? One thinks as freely as the other. We Christians think there is a God, and we are free in thinking so. The Atheist thinks there is not a God, and is free in thinking so. There is as much free thought on the one side as on the other, and each is subject to the penalties of his thought, each must abide the consequences of his thought concerning God, just as each must abide the consequences of his thought concerning his health, his life, his business, or concerning any other fact in this life. The only difference is that the consequences of misthought or disbelief in the one case are more serious, are more lasting than in the other, but that does not at all affect the principle that thinking wrongly concerning divine or eternal facts may hurt our souls, just as thinking wrongly of material or physical facts may hurt our bodies. Therefore it is not an unreasonable thing—it is the most reasonable of all things—to say that before a man shall be saved it is of all things necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. One word more we have to say on this matter, and but one, and that is what I have already alluded to. The Catholic Faith, the articles of the Catholic Faith, are largely relating to fact, and altogether relating to things outside of ourselves, to things which exist, whether we believe in them or not. In that respect the old Catholic idea of the Faith differs very widely and very seriously from many modern notions of faith, and what faith and belief is. You will find no word in the Creed which bids you believe something about yourself, no word which bids you think that you have got faith, and because you have got faith you are going to be saved. There is no word in the Creed that rests your salvation on what you feel, on what you have felt, or what you think you feel. You are not asked in the Creed to believe in your own belief; you are not asked to believe that you are instantaneously saved because on a given day, or at a given hour, you feel something within you—that is not part of the Christian Creed. It is not essential that he should think that, but it is essential to man's salvation that he should believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; that he should believe in these great eternal verities which exist, and that depend for their existence on no belief, no emotion, no thought of ours, and if he truly and really believes this, then it must have an

effect on his life. It is because men *think* they believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and do not believe in them, that their creed has no effect on their lives; but he who in his heart believes he has a Father in Heaven will have faith in Him, will pray to Him, and desire to love and serve Him. He who in his heart believes that the Son of God came down from Heaven to die for him, to bear his sins upon the tree, and loved him so that He gave His life for him, will love Him, and desire to give his life for Him. He who believes in sin will joyfully hear of baptism for the remission of sin, and he who believes there is a Holy Ghost will joyfully believe that that Holy Spirit will work upon his spirit, and that Christ has chosen him "through the sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth." And therefore it is, brethren, that we vow and promise as we enter into this kingdom of God through baptism, or others promise it for us, and on the faith of their promise we enter the kingdom —it is vowed and promised on our behalf that, not only we renounce the kingdom of darkness as we are admitted into the kingdom of light, that we not only obey God's commandments, the King of the kingdom we have entered, but also that we should believe those great verities of the Christian Faith, that we should recognise the existence of those eternal facts that concern our salvation, and recognising those facts, and shaping our life in accordance with those facts, they become the very light of our life, and so God's purpose is accomplished in us, "through sanctification of the spirit, and belief of the truth."

## THE NATURE, THE HISTORY, AND THE HOPE OF TOLERANCE.

By the Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D., Rector of Trinity Church, Boston, U.S.A.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge.

"And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will be overthrown: but if it is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them; lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God."—Acts v. 38, 39, R. V.

THESE words are Gamaliel's strong plea for tolerance. A stronger plea for that great virtue never has been made, and so I turn to it at once, as, kindly permitted to come and preach in your great University, I venture to undertake to speak of tolerance. I choose that subject partly because it interests me very deeply, and partly because it seems to me as if there were no men to whom one could so fitly speak of it as an assemblage of scholars and of students. To them, more than to other men, must come the puzzling problems and interesting suggestions which the whole subject of tolerance involves.

I want to speak about the Nature, and the History, and the Hope of Tolerance.

The day is past when one need make a plea for tolerance. It may come back again. It is not now. But all the more because it is the favourite virtue of the time it is interesting and necessary that we should thoughtfully study it and try to understand it. The very praise that we so lavishly pour upon it may destroy it, like the little German prince who, Carlyle tells us, was killed by the noise of the cannon fired in rejoicing at his birth. How tolerance may be wise, and so be lasting, ought to be the special study of our day.

I call my subject tolerance, not toleration. Tolerance is a disposition. Toleration is the behaviour in which that disposition finds expression. A disposition is to its appropriate behaviour as a man is to his shadow. The shadow represents the man, but it often misrepresents him. It is larger than he is, or smaller. It runs before him or it lags behind him, according as he stands related to the light which casts it. We sometimes have to guess at what the man is by his shadow, and so we are constantly having to guess at men's dispositions by their behaviour; but we never can let ourselves forget that the disposition is the living thing, and so to it our thoughts and study must be given. Therefore I speak of tolerance, and not of toleration.

In studying first, then, the nature of tolerance, that much-belauded and much-misrepresented grace of our own time, we want to start with this assertion, which is, indeed, the key assertion of all I have to say, that it is composed of two elements, both of which are necessary to its true existence, and on the harmonious and proportionate blending of which the quality of the tolerance which is the result depends. The elements are: (1.) Positive Conviction, and (2.) Sympathy with men whose convictions differ from our own. Does it sound strange to claim that both these elements are necessary to make a true tolerance? Have we been in the habit of thinking that strong positive conviction was almost incompatible with tolerance? Have we, perhaps, been almost afraid to yield to the temptation to let ourselves go into the tolerant disposition of our time, because it seemed to us as if there were no place there for that sure and strong belief which we knew was the first necessity of a strong human life? It would not be strange if we had all felt such a fear. It would be strange if any of us had entirely escaped it, so studiously, so constantly, so earnestly has the world been assured that positive faith and tolerance have no fellowship with one another. "The only foundation for tolerance," said Charles James Fox, "is a degree of scepticism." Not many months ago a most respected clergyman of my own town, speaking at the dedication of a statue of John Harvard, in the university which bears his name, declared of the Puritans, by whom that college was

created, "They were intolerant as all men, the world over, in all time, have always been and will always be when they are in solemn earnest for truth or error." I think that those are melancholy words. The historical fact is melancholy enough. That we must grant as mainly true, though not without fair and notable exceptions; but to foretell that man will never come to the condition in which he can be earnest and tolerant at once, that is beyond all things melancholy. That spreads a darkness over all the future, and obliterates man's brightest hope. That condemns mankind to an endless choice betweeen earnest bigotry and tolerant indifference, or rather to an endless swinging back and forth between the two in hopeless discontent, in everlasting despair of rest. Against all such statements of despair we want to take the strongest ground; we want to assert most strongly that so far from earnest personal conviction and generous tolerance being incompatible with one another, the two are necessary each to each. "It is the natural feeling of all of us," said Frederick Maurice, in one of those utterances of his which at first sound like paradoxes, and by-and-by seem to be axioms, "It is the natural feeling of all of us that charity is founded upon the uncertainty of truth. I believe it is founded on the certainty of truth."

One token that this is true is that only with both these elements present in it does tolerance become a clear, definable, respectable position for a man to stand in, an honourable quality for a character to possess. Dr. Holmes, in his "Life of Mr. Emerson," declares that the word tolerance is an insult as applied by one set of well-behaved people to another. No doubt there are insulting tones enough in which the word may be used, but the word itself is not insulting. It expresses a perfectly legitimate and honourable relation between two minds and natures which there is no other word to express. Here is my friend with whom I totally agree. His thoughts and convictions are the same as mine. I do not tolerate him. There is no place for toleration there. Here is my other friend, who disagrees with me entirely. I disagree with him, but I respect him, I want him to be true to his convictions, and while I claim the right and duty of arguing with him, and trying to show him that I am right and he is wrong, I would not silence him by violence if I could. I would not for the world have him say that he thinks I am right before his reason is convinced. Now, that is tolerance. Is there any insult there? Is not that a recognisable manly position for me to stand in as regards my friend? Is either his manhood or mine injured or despised? But is it not clear also that the healthiness of this tolerance which is in me towards him depends upon its integrity? It is because both its elements are there that it is a sound condition worthy of his soul and mine. Take either away, and the element which is left becomes insulting, but then it is not tolerance which is insulting, for this is not tolerance, for tolerance is the meeting in perfect harmony of earnest conviction and personal indulgence.

Any one who has thoughtfully observed human life knows very well that any quality which for its fullest perfections involves two elements will almost certainly present strange and perplexing complications before it comes to its complete condition. Strange indeed is the method of the moral progress of mankind. Not as the ship sails through the water evenly, altogether, every part keeping pace with every other part; rather as the man walks, bringing forward first one side and then the other, one side being at any given moment in advance of the other, equilibrium being always lost and regained again a little farther on, to be re-lost again immediately; so, as the man walks, does the moral progress of mankind advance. Thus it is that conviction of truth and allowance of dissent are never in perfect balance and proportion to each other. Now one and now the other of them is always in advance, as the whole man in this uneven sideling moves steadily forward toward the time when he shall be tolerant of his fellow-men just in proportion to the earnestness with which he holds his own well-proven truth.

This leads to certain complications which it will be well to notice, because they very often, as I think, confuse our thought on the whole subject, and seem to leave us all adrift. Here are two men who stand and look out together over the whole world of opinion. They are not a part of it, for neither of them has any real opinions of his own. They are like men who stand together on a sea-shore rock and look out over the ocean. It is nothing to them which way the waves are running and how they cross and recross each other in tumultuous confusion. It is nothing to these men how other men are thinking. They are entirely indulgent. They call themselves and the world calls them tolerant. And now suppose that one of those men gets a conviction. He becomes thoroughly in earnest for something which he believes is true. What is the immediate result? Almost certainly there comes a chill and a reserve in his indulgence. Now it appears to him to be a dreadful thing that other men think so wrongly. All the indifference is gone, and the man is almost more than man, almost divinely true and sound, if he is not betrayed by his earnestness into some sort of bigotry, some intolerant wish towards these men in error. He lifts the axe or lights the fire of persecution. Meanwhile there stands his brother where he used to stand, still smiling his universal smile and saying benignly to all the creeds, and heresies, and opinions, "God bless you every one," because he has no real creed, or opinions, or even a genuine hearty heresy of his own. And now, which of these two men shall we praise? Beyond all doubt the man of earnestness, the man of

positive faith. But then he is a bigot! Will you praise Torquemada, standing in triumph beside his burning victims in the market place in Seville, more than Montaigne, a century later, sitting in his library at Paris and patronising all the faiths of which he believed not one, all of which in his soul he despised? If Torquemada ever had been like Montaigne, and had become a persecutor out of pure conviction, then forcible as is this which he is doing, awful as is the livid flame which lights his virtue, I must praise him and his Inquisition, for these two good things are in him: first, a firm belief in something as the truth of God, and next a passionate desire that the truth of God should reign upon the earth.

But what then? We know that this is not final. This praise of the bigot is not praise of bigotry. We are thankful for the traveller that he has left the City of Destruction, and that he is on the way to the New Jerusalem, but none the less we feel the misery of the slough of despond through which he is struggling on the way. One Inquisitor has made a real advance from the easy intolerance in which he used to live, but it has been as if, having started on his journey, he went back to get one part of his equipment without which his journey could not successfully be made. The man who thus goes on shore again to get his sails creeps out of the harbour behind the other sailless boat, which is only drifting on the tide, but nevertheless it is nearer to the ultimate haven which they both are seeking, for the boat that has no sails will never come there at all. So, to state it quite without a figure, there are times when the intolerant man, in virtue, not of his own intolerance, but of that which for the time has caused him to be intolerant, is farther on towards the ultimate tolerance than his indulgent brother who stands in horror at his bigotry. Such is the curious complication which often marks men's development on the world's progress in any good attainment. There comes a seeming loss of that which is all the time being gained. It is like the circles on an eddying stream. There is one point in the circle which the eddy makes, one drop of the stream's waters which is distinctly going backward, going up the stream. It seems to be going away from the ocean and back towards the fountain. It is not so far toward the ocean as another drop which is hurrying by it with its eager face set toward the sea. And yet the backward plunging drop will reach the ocean first. The drop which now is hurrying seaward has got the same weary circuit to make before it can really find the sea it seeks. It is a blessed thing to know that both of them in all their eddyings and wanderings are borne upon the bosom of a stream greater than either of them, which never ceases to press onward to the ocean which is the final home of all.

There is no law which it is more necessary for one who studies human life and character to understand than this law to which I have just alluded. The law of the three conditions, we may call it. The law of life, death, and the higher life, would be its fuller name. Jesus said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Whosoever loseth his life for My sake," He said, "the same shall save it." See what some of the illustrations are. The crude hopefulness of boyhood passes through the disappointments which it is sure to meet, and comes out, if it keeps its health, into the robust and sanguine faith of middle age. A merely traditional religion goes into doubt and gathers there strength of personality, and comes forth the reasonable religion of a full-grown man. Innocence perishes in temptation, to be born again out of the fires as virtue. Life, death, and resurrection is the law of life. And bigotry and tolerance can never be deeply understood unless we know how easy indulgence often has to die in narrow positive conviction before it can be born again as the generous tolerance of the thoroughly believing man.

The truth that qualities have their qualities is one which we need always to remember. You have not told the whole story when you have said that a man is kind, or brave, or truthful, any more than you have given a complete account when you have said of the sunset or of the bird's wing that it is red, when you have said of the sky or of the violet that it is blue. As there are colours of colours, so there are qualities of qualities. "How is he truthful, or brave, or kind?" That question still remains for you to ask. And in large part this quality of a quality will be indicated by the motive which at any particular moment calls the quality forth into action. The qualities of qualities are largely denoted by the colours of their motives showing through. This is quite true of tolerance. Let me enumerate very briefly some of the qualities of that quality, and see how each one is coloured by the hue of its motive. I think that in various kinds of tolerance we can see six colours distinctly showing through. First, there is the lowest of all, that of which I have already spoken, the tolerance of pure indifference, the mere result of aimless good-nature. If I do not care or do not think it possible to know whether there is a God or not, why should I not be perfectly willing that this man should say that there is and this other man should say that there is not? Secondly, there is the tolerance of policy, the allowing of error because it would do more harm than good to try to root it out, the voluntary disuse of a right to eradicate it, the leaving of the tares for the wheat's sake. This is the tolerance of which Burke speaks when he says that "toleration is a part of moral and political prudence." Thirdly, there is the tolerance of helplessness. This is the acquiescence in the utterance of error because we cannot help ourselves. It is the tolerance of persecuted minorities. It was the tolerance of Jeremy Taylor writ-

ing the "Liberty of Prophesying" while the Parliament were masters in the land. Fourthly, there is the tolerance of pure respect for man. In entire disagreement with a man's opinion, you are able still cordially to recognise his right to his own thought, simply because he is a man, whether his thought will do harm or good. Fifthly, there is the tolerance of spiritual sympathy. The man's opinions are all wrong, but he means well, and you have grown to feel the value of your spiritual oneness. And sixthly, there is the tolerance of the enlarged view of truth, combined with a cordial and entire faith in God. This is the tolerance for which Milton has pleaded in his application of the Myth of Typhon and Osiris, the tolerance which grows up in any man who is aware that truth is larger than his conception of it, and that what seem to be other men's errors must often be other parts of the truth of which he has only a portion, and that truth is God's child, and the fortunes of truth are God's care as well as his.

These are the six, Indifference, Policy, Helplessness, Human Respect, Spiritual Sympathy, the Vastness of Truth. These are the different colours which may shine through men's tolerances, and show what is the quality of this quality in each of them. You see where the group divides in the middle. The first three kinds of tolerance have something base about them; the last three are all noble. Just where that cleavage and division runs, the death of tolerance of which I spoke a while ago is very likely to come in. Just there a man, entering into the power of some strong conviction, is liable to become intolerant, and his intolerance, coming there and thus, is full of hope for the better tolerance which lies in its three degrees beyond. The man is at sea only because he had set sail from the solid shore, which is malarious and barren, to reach by-and-by the far more solid land which is bright, and healthy, and fruitful. Do you not see how necessary it is to know the kind of a man's tolerance, to see what is the quality of this quality in every tolerant man?

If we try to get still deeper at the roots of the impression which prevails so widely, that positive convictions are unnecessary to and even incompatible with the tolerance of opinions which are different from our own, I think that we shall find that it results from the low and meagre idea which so many people, even of those who talk the most about the sacredness of their convictions, have with regard to what a real conviction is. A true conviction, anything thoroughly believed, is personal. It becomes part of the believer's character as well as a possession of his brain. It makes him another and a deeper man. And every deepening of a human nature centralises it, so to speak; carries it in, that is, to the centre of the sphere upon whose surface are described all the specific faiths of men. At the centre of that sphere sits the spirit of truth which we call truthfulness, of which all these specific faiths of men are the more or less imperfect and distorted utterances. The man who comes into that central place sits there with the spirit of truth, and feels her power going out to the faiths she feeds on every side. It is in virtue of that centralness which he has reached that he is able to understand and sympathise with the whole. Deepen the Desert of Sahara to the centre of the earth, and it will know how the Himalayas came to be so rocky and so high. And so the advice to give to every bigot whom you want to make a tolerant man must be, not "Hold your faith more lightly, and make less of it," but "Hold your faith more profoundly, and make more of it." Get down to its just spiritual meaning, grasp its fundamental truth, so you will be glad that your brother starts from that same centre, though he strikes the circumference at quite another point from yours. It is true, strange as it sounds at first, that the more deeply and spiritually a man believes in fixed endless punishment of wicked men, the more, and not the less, tolerant he will become of his brother who cherishes the eternal hope.

Perhaps it is stating the same truth in a little different way when we say that true tolerance consists in the love of truth and the love of man, each brought to its perfection, and living in perfect harmony with one another, but that these two great affections are perfect and in perfect harmony only when they are orbed and enfolded in the yet greater affection of the love of God. The love of truth alone grows cruel. It has no pity for man. It cries out, "What matter is a human life tortured or killed for truth—crushed under the chariot-wheels with which she travels to her kingdom?" The stake-fires and the scaffolds belong to her, and the love of man alone grows weak. It trims, and moulds, and travesties the truth to suit men's whims. "Do you want truth to be this? Then this it shall be," it cries to the faithless or the lazy soul.

The love of truth alone is cruel. The love of man alone is weak and sentimental. It is only when truth and man are loved within the love of God, loved for His sake, truth loved as His utterance, man loved as His child, only then is it that they meet and blend in tolerance. Therefore it is that absolute and steadfast tolerance, so far from being the enemy of religion, as men have foolishly said, can only come religiously, can never be complete till man completely loves his God.

* * * * *

I turn to you, the students of God, of science, and of human life, many of you the future ministers of Christ. You must be men; you must be ministers of tolerance. But the true way in which you can be that, is to forget tolerance, and be ever more and more completely men of Christ. So you must be led on into that only worthy tolerance which, as I have tried to show this afternoon, and as

I should like to say once more before I close, consists of the love of truth and the love of man harmonised and included in the love of God. To that great Divine tolerance may the Spirit of God, our Father, bring us all!

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 12, 1886.

## THE SOCIAL MISSION OF THE CHURCH.

IT has been continuously asserted during the last few months, that the Church of England has failed in her duty, and that she has not reached the great masses of the people. But this statement will not hold good, especially when it is carefully examined and looked into. It is true that a great deal remains to be done, and yet if we only compare the present with the past generation, every candid and unbiassed person must admit that things are better. And if we only make diligent use of the opportunities which are now placed within our reach, a great deal more may yet be realised. The Church has got a respite for a time, but how long it may continue it is impossible to say. If Mr. Chamberlain and his party can have their own way, the present state of things will soon be altered; and therefore it behoves us to be up and doing, the town clergy to instruct more perfectly the artisans and mechanics, the rural clergy to instruct as far as possible the somewhat heavy and bucolic rustic; so that, when the time comes, they may be able and ready to give a decided negative to any proposal for robbing them of their Church and its endowments. In order to keep "touch" with the people, the clergy must adapt themselves as far as possible to the needs of the age. It used to be said years ago (of course speaking figuratively), that the clergy had "swallowed pokers"; the meaning of which was, that they were stiff and unbending. We must, however, remember that the Church has a *social mission* as well as a religious mission. It is not that the clergyman should be seen on the Sunday only, or that he should preach able, earnest, and carefully thought-out sermons, for all clergymen should do this, but that he should also be one among his people in many ways. In the summer, we believe that one of the best ways for a parochial clergyman to reach the young men of his flock, is to be amongst them in the cricket-field, taking an interest in every match, and showing the greatest interest in the success of the club; if he can play himself, and make a good leg hit, or bowl a *yorker*, so much the better. And if unable to play, still if he is there, his presence will have its effect, because it shows that he cares for them, and takes an interest in their pleasures and enjoyments.

There is nothing derogatory to the clerical character in all this, for he is the clergyman all the same, and we have got beyond the time when all enjoyments and recreations were looked upon as so much time wasted. Times have changed since John Wesley, when starting the school at Kingswood, decreed that the children should *not* play! forgetting that it is the nature of every one, especially in early years, to enjoy a game in a greater or less degree.

In the winter months there is ample scope for the development of this social mission of the Church. We have all kinds of organisations, Temperance Missions, Village Clubs, Mutual Improvement Associations, and the like, and there is plenty of room for bringing out the better side of human nature. And if the Church will only use these means, simple and effective as they are, "civilising influences" as they have been called, much will be gained, and the Church will take deep root in the affections of the English people, and it will take a strong arm to uproot her. Proof of this we have lately seen, and we shall possibly see even stronger testimony to the vitality and power of the English Church.

But besides the ordinary routine work, and the carrying on of the various organisations which exist, we believe that the clergy might do a great deal of good, especially in country parishes, by taking up what are called "social" questions, and lecturing upon them, and so to help the labouring classes to realise and know more about these things than they do at present. We believe that the late Charles Kingsley did this, and with capital results; and why should not others try to tread in his steps? We are constantly hearing of the most grotesque blunders which have occurred in connection with the late elections—blunders which in many cases will doubtless cause a smile; and yet if we look at it aright, these mistakes reflect to a certain extent on the Church, and that knowing these things we shall do all in our power to remedy them. Of course, with the development of the educational system now in vogue, much will be altered, and we may hope for better things in the future. Yet the Church must take the lead in the cause of progress, and this we imagine may well be done if social subjects are touched upon and dealt with in a masterly manner.

It may be urged that, in what we have stated, we are placing a heavier burden upon the backs of

the parochial clergy than they can bear. We have no wish to do this, far from it; but what we do wish to see is, the rural clergy rising to the situation, and using the time that is given them to strengthen the walls of their Zion, and to show to their people the reasons *why* they are Church people. And laymen can help in these other matters, for the Church does not consist of the clergy entirely, far from it, and therefore it is incumbent upon all to help. And so with clear, definite statements from the pulpit, aided and supplemented by lectures on social, sanitary, and other practical subjects, much can be done. And we have the highest authority for this work. Our blessed Lord was a teacher of morality, and dealt with social subjects, and if we only follow in His footsteps, we shall gain the victory. Let the Church, then, fulfil her mission in its twofold aspect, a teacher of and a witness for the truth, and to develop that social mission which belongs to her by inherent right.

## MR. GLADSTONE'S DEFEAT.

THIS is a subject for congratulation and thanksgiving to all classes in the United Kingdom, more especially to the middle and lower classes of Irishmen, who are now, by the criminal connivance of Messrs. Gladstone, Morley and Co., misled, terrorised, and tyrannised over by Land Leaguers and priests. The preposterous Irish Government Bill, justly styled a bundle of impossibilities, has been rejected by so considerable a majority—which is sure to be endorsed by an emphatic verdict of the constituencies—that we believe the agitation for Home Rule, in the sense in which Messrs. Parnell and Gladstone use the term, will quickly subside. We question whether even the Grand Old Orator, if he stumps the country, will be able to keep it alive, except in Ireland, where alone he will be able to preach his new anti-coercion gospel, sanctioned by the Romanist priests, of Thou shalt kill, Thou shalt steal, Thou shalt bear false witness, Thou shalt covet, and any other Parnellite commandment approved by Archbishops Croke and Walsh. His sudden conversion to this evangel of Home Rule and anti coercion proves Mr. Gladstone to be, as we have often described him, a typical opportunist, a great egotist, whose success is an illusion, and whose leadership is an imposture. Up to December last he strenuously opposed Home Rule, and denounced Mr. Parnell and his associates as traitors, murderers, etc., and once rightly put them in jail; but when, by the cruel and relentless terrorism and tyranny of the Land League, Mr. Parnell had secured eighty-six supporters at the Parliamentary Election, he suddenly became converted, and vigorously took up the cause of Home Rule, and professed to find in it the cause of justice! We trust that in the coming Election our Archbishops, Bishops, and clergy will set aside all self-seeking and flattery of the working classes, and endeavour to lead their flocks to make a wise choice in favour of the integrity of the Empire, and of the immutable laws of morality.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### FREE TRADE.

SIR,—I am very glad to congratulate your correspondent that he is able to state that he lives in a very prosperous *part* of the country. A part, if I may remind him, is not the whole. Did he ever hear the story of the minister of Cumbræ, who prayed for a blessing on his own country and the neighbouring isle—Britain? He reminds me very forcibly of it.

I am sorry he did not see the point of my remarks, when I referred to his instances of prosperous trades. It seemed to me like a consumptive man congratulating himself that he was well, seeing that his hair was long. What is the trade of collar-making in comparison of our great industries? and all, more or less, languishing.

"A condition of perfect and universal Free Trade is practicable through the universal abolition of all indirect taxes." In other words, Free Trade is practicable under impossible condition. Such a proposition is not worth serious discussion. I hope your correspondent sees this.

I have read the explanation which "B." gives of the principle which is responsible for all our ills, but I am unable to make anything of it. "When the demand for an article of commerce falls off, the supply remaining the same, the price will diminish." He referred us in his last letter to a work on political economy. This work was said to deal with the price of gold. Further, it was said to explain how this decrease in the value of gold would account for loss of trade. I asked for the process to be explained. This is my answer. I venture to submit that "B." is trifling.

I said in a former letter that there was a factor in trade always to be taken into account. This factor was the principle involved in the formula—Supply and demand. I referred "B." to what would follow if he took six horses to the market, and found only three purchasers. If I remember right, he simply ignored my position. Now he takes this one aspect of the whole thing, and finds in it an explanation of all that is wrong. I refer him again to what I said in proof that it is an argument against Free Trade—Free Trade as it obtains amongst us.

"B." does not understand what I mean by being practical. I hoped to be spared the necessity of telling him that modesty is more becoming than the garb of pretended learning. If he knows anything let us have the benefit of it by all means. We do not want the assurance that he is learned in all the learning of the Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians. We will take all this for granted as soon as we have practical experience of it. He has come forth as the

champion of Free Trade, but is not able to produce a single rational argument in its favour.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage.
June 5th, 1886.

## A REPLY TO AN INQUIRY.

SIR,—Your clerical correspondent, in his very interesting article on "Preaching," comes to the conclusion that the cause of the decay of pulpit-power is the use of manuscript sermons. He has also the idea "that the manuscript destroys freedom, crushes out enthusiasm, produces laziness, deadens all spiritual life, and arouses a feeling of unreality in the hearts of the preacher and his congregation." *Audi alteram partem.* There was a certain ancient enthusiast, of whom it was said that his letters were weighty and powerful, while, on the other hand, his speech was contemptible, and his bodily presence weak. In that case, manuscript was the successful vehicle of a most fruitful enthusiasm. The present writer has only twice in his life witnessed a vast and permanent effect being produced on minds, convictions, and lives, by sermons. One case was that of Dr. Arnold, of Rugby; and the other of John Henry Newman. Both of these wrote their sermons word for word; the latter polished his with wonderful minuteness. And yet both were enthusiasts, and the work of each not only told at the moment, but produced abiding fruits. Manning, in his Oxford days, preached elaborately-written sermons; so did Samuel Wilberforce; so did Pusey, and all the influential men in the Oxford movement. Arthur Stanley wrote his sermons. I only once heard Kingsley, and I thought it was a written sermon. I never heard Liddon; but I have heard his hearers draw a comparison between his written and his unwritten sermons, very much to the disadvantage of the latter. I think that Farrar always has a MS. before him when he preaches. Foreign preachers do not take written sermons into the pulpit, but they write them elaborately, and then learn them off by heart. Under this process, a discourse often becomes more stale and tiresome to its author, and therefore is more mechanically delivered, than one that has been written off *currente calamo.* Men like Bossuet and Massillon wrote their sermons painfully. The great orators have done the same. Demosthenes wrote his orations; and those which related to private causes he sold to be delivered by other persons. Cicero likewise used the pen. Lord Brougham sometimes wrote his great speeches more than once over.

In our age, when readers are so many, the pen is ever more and more triumphing over the *vox viva.* The orators in Parliament address not their hearers, nor the empty benches, to which they often play, but the readers of the newspapers. If your correspondent would ascertain the cause of the decay of the pulpit, he must look deeper.

A QUILL-DRIVER.

SIR,—A reply suggested itself to an inquiry made in the leading article which appeared yesterday in the PULPIT. The words are: "Confessedly there is in most preaching a something wanting. What—what is it?" The reply is, "earnest convictions."

I could not now accept the interpretations of the Sacred Volume which I used to hear with acquiescence in my youth. But I retain a vivid recollection that the preachers seemed to have a solemn sense that they were bringing momentous truths before their hearers. There was an earnestness in most of them which impressed me greatly.

I seldom hear a sermon now which suggests to me anything more than notions. Rarely come before me looks, tones, and words, which convey living thoughts and emotions. My own explanation as a layman is, that our clergy have not a consciousness of liberty, to speak or to write what they really think and feel. The greatest proportion of them can hardly be said to have more freedom than Roman Catholics in these respects, in spite of the protests we make against the mental slavery in that Church. Few of them, apparently, dare to touch, by speech, writing, or even in their own thoughts, on certain topics, although they are of the highest importance in relation to our dearest interests. Penalties and disabilities are suspended over them. I was told last year by a Canon, that an eminent man—whose name is mentioned in this very article as constantly attracting crowds of eager listeners for years past—would have been a Bishop long ago, if he had not manifested some independence of thought, which, although resented by officialism, seems to be warmly appreciated by multitudes, cultured and uncultured.

Why is it still difficult to obtain a seat when he preaches? Because he ministers to the sacred wants of humanity more than others. There is a cry—a despairing cry for the Living God—a God that can be loved. Human hearts long to find a refuge, a support, a rock higher than they; a tender breast on which they may lean. They gaze almost wildly around for light to cheer and guide.

Let the clergy look to it, whether they have pompous titles, and sit with princes, or are humble workers, plodding and toiling wearily. This startling and solemn inquiry is formulated, not by a layman, but by one of their own order. It is not a question of loaves and fishes. Moral courage is the great need of our age in religion and politics, and an earnest appreciation of truth above all things. There actually seems to be a growing number of young men in England who are looking to Buddhism; while many others practically do that which was stigmatised by Isaiah: "They seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter." It would appear that without that resource they find themselves unable to emerge from mere Materialism, in spite of the costly and complicated religious appliances around them.

J. B.

Surbiton, 6th June, 1886.

## SELF-DENIAL.

SIR,—The Rev. J. P. Sandlands has further elucidated his views on self-denial. I cannot say he has *proved* them to be scriptural.

It is clear that I was not unduly severe upon Mr. Sandlands when I said that he *did not believe* in self-denial. He now frankly writes: "Self-denial has no place with me." He reminds me of a clergyman whom I met here a few years ago, and who told me that life to him was "a perpetual picnic." Mr. Sandlands had already told us that self-denial (denying to

self little pleasures) was *not* a virtue, and he now tells us that "to be virtuous there must be the element of pleasure." Is this so? The drunkard has been induced to attend a temperance lecture, and he resolves to do now what he has not done for years—pass the public-house without going in. He does it. Satisfaction may come afterwards, but at the time it is little else than positive pain. Who will say that there was *no virtue* in that act of self-denial—an act which to him may be the beginning of a new life?

I am content, however, to take Mr. Sandlands' own illustration. He tells us that, on alighting at a railway station, and finding that he has still some distance to go, his "first impression," that is, the instinct of his "baser nature," is to get into a cab and drive off. He manfully overcomes this instinct when he reflects upon the good that may be done by the shilling thus saved. I only hope that he never forgets to give the shilling to "some poor body"; for if unwittingly he should add it to his reserve fund, it might fairly be open to question whether the more virtuous course after all was not to get into the cab and drive off, and so help the poor cabman to support his family. Mr. Sandlands tells us that in his opinion his "baser nature" had *no claim to be heard*. Very probably not, but nevertheless it *was heard* in that "first impression"—an impression that was only got rid of by a distinct mental effort. He had to reason himself out of his temptation to self-indulgence, and thus his heroic act of virtue was only accomplished by the exercise of a certain degree of self-denial!

Moreover, his illustration seems to show that he does not belong to the body of muscular Christians; for any one of these would have *preferred* a healthy walk across country to being cooped up within the limits of a cab on a hot day.

Mr. Sandlands says that my reference to St. Luke ix. 23, is "very unhappy." Why it is so I cannot conceive, except that it is fatal to his peculiar theory that self-denial is not a virtue. It will be time enough to discuss with him the Greek terms when he can *show* that our revisers have mis-translated the passage. If he desires to know more respecting my views of self-denial, I may perhaps venture to commend to his notice a sermon of mine on "Work," and published in your columns March 26, 1881.

Permit me to add that I cordially agree with "Presbyter's" remarks on self-denial, and published in your last number.

C. B. BRIGSTOCKE, Chaplain.

Homburg, Germany.
June 7, 1886.

## THE LATE PROFESSOR F. D. MAURICE.

On Wednesday, the 2nd inst., a portrait of the late Professor F. D. Maurice, by Mr. Lowes Dickinson, one of his pupils, was unveiled at Queen's College, Harley Street, by the Rev. Llewelyn Davies. In opening the proceedings Mr. Davies delivered a short address, in the course of which he said:—It has been thought that the ceremony of presenting to the college a worthy portrait of Mr. Maurice would be a fit occasion for bringing together some of his old pupils, and for an endeavour to commend his memory to the intelligent reverence of the existing generation of Queen's College students. We owe both the portrait and this meeting to the zeal of our valued lady resident, Miss Croudace, herself an old student of this college and pupil of its founder. The college already possesses a definite memorial of Mr. Maurice in the scholarship which bears his name, and through which many of our best students have been proud to be associated with him. But it will be a great gain to have an image of Mr. Maurice, as he spoke and taught, continually before the eyes of those who come to be members of his college. We are accustomed to speak of Maurice as the founder of Queen's College. The title must not be understood as excluding others from a share in the planning and making of it. But Mr. Maurice, by taking up the idea, made it his own; he gave it dignity, and drew support to it; and not only the public, but all his colleagues, felt the college to be virtually his creation. Queen's College has been followed by many another institution having the same general purpose of giving to women, without reserve, the full education which had previously been regarded as the exclusive property of the stronger sex—by academical colleges and high schools which we have ceased to number. It is the glory of this college not to have stood alone, but to have led the way. To Mr. Maurice it was a keen interest and delight to embody in this new foundation three principles which were especially dear to him. First, it was one of his lifelong convictions that both the sexes ought to share together in the solid studies, in the accumulated inheritance and in the highest aspirations of the human race. We can, therefore, understand with what enthusiasm he could welcome, some twenty years later, a suggestion that the professors of King's College and other men of similar standing should offer to young women preparing to be governesses and to others who would join them substantially the same teaching as was given to the young men of the King's College classes. The first programme of Queen's College included instruction in Latin, in mathematics, in natural philosophy, as well as in the subjects which were embraced by the ordinary curriculum of the young ladies' school. The second principle which he kept in view with regard to all education and in the establishing of this college was the maintenance of a high ideal. He testified without ceasing that in all study and all teaching, in the framing of systems and the organising of institutions, the highest aims should be watchfully kept before the minds of teachers and pupils, of founders and administrators. He could not endure that it should be put before the common people, or before any class, that children and young people must be educated in order that they might get on in the world. He looked with misgivings upon the immense extension of competitive prize-hunting in schools and colleges and public employment. It was therefore undoubtedly agreeable to him that—except in the form of a few scholarships—there were no prizes in Queen's College. He was glad to use the absence of prizes as a witness for that noble and ennobling character of education which it seemed to him of infinite importance to uphold. A third principle illustrated in this foundation, which it is impossible in recalling any part of Mr. Maurice's work and testimony to overlook, is the assertion of theology as the corner-stone of all studies. But he did not mean by it the framing of a system of doctrines. He took the word in its primary and proper sense. It was the investigation of what had been made known about God. To understand human life or even nature without taking

into account God's revelation of Himself seemed to him a hopeless attempt. Who that ever heard of Frederick Denison Maurice does not know that this was the mind in which, through all his honoured and fruitful life, he studied and taught and laboured? He opened his soul, if a man ever did, to inspiration from above, and we need not wonder that he seemed to those who heard him to speak as one inspired. I venture to think that in the portrait now to be unveiled, our dear friend the artist has been not unsuccessful in conveying some impression of that peculiar blending of humility and authority which constrained all who heard him to listen with a reverence which they felt towards no one else. The givers of this picture of their master desire that such an influence may continue to be shed upon Queen's College, and that students who look up to it may still be helped by him to see a light from heaven falling on all their studies, and to know the world into which they are sent and their own calling in it to be divine.

The Rev. W. Benham said that eight-and-twenty years ago it was his privilege to be associated with Maurice in the work of that college. He well remembered a lecture on Addison, in which Maurice, with a keen appreciation of all that was excellent in his subject, covered with his keen sarcasm all that was trivial and artificial in the days of Queen Anne. No one who had ever come in contact with Maurice could ever forget the impression of his depth and earnestness and devotion of character.

Prebendary Harry Jones gave some reminiscences of Maurice's parochial labours among the poor and sick of the parish in which he then held a cure and which adjoined the parish in which Maurice lived.

Canon Percival, president of Trinity College, Oxford, in referring to the friendship which he enjoyed with Maurice and Charles Kingsley, who always referred to Maurice as "the Master," dwelt upon the great privilege of being taught in an institution of which one could be proud, a privilege which, mainly in consequence of Maurice's work and influence, was enjoyed in full measure by the students of that college.

A LETTER on "What is Schism?" from the pen of Canon Wilberforce, appears in his "Parish Magazine." Canon Wilberforce says he is convinced that the present tendency is against exclusiveness and in the direction of the freest communion between those who differ as to methods, creeds, and definitions of faith; and that "no English Churchman does credit to himself or honour to his Church by speaking superciliously of godly dissenters, by calling them heretics and schismatics, and by refusing to receive the Word of God from their lips, when it is manifest they are doing, and doing well, nearly half the Christian work of this country."

AT Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, the old sanctuary steps have been removed, and polished green granite substituted for them. The Communion-table has been raised and the footpace enriched with a representation of the passion flower in ceramic mosaic. All the remaining spaces inside the altar-rail, which are of polished brass, are laid with encaustic tiles of a rich design. Lady Brabazon has kindly offered to give a new pulpit of alabaster and marble of very rich design, and another member of the congregation has promised to defray the cost of a baptistry, within which will be placed an inlaid marble and alabaster font. The work has been executed by Messrs. Underwood.

IT is not very often nowadays one meets with a church with the old high pews, yet one such still exists at Pentlow, in Essex. The tower is round, probably so built to save the expense of transporting the angle stones, which are not to be found in this part. The chancel forms an apse, which is peculiarly Norman in England. Wright, in his "History of Essex," says the font is Saxon. Attached to the chancel is a chapel where some of the ancient family of Kempes are buried. Upon their tomb are three recumbent figures, and at the side a family of fourteen children kneeling. This church is about to be restored, although the funds locally collected will not admit of its being done so well as it should be. On the back of the old register book is a list of the rectors from 1315.

THE petition which was sent to the House of Laymen by the Church Property Defence Association stated that the association, as representing the interests of private patrons, regarded with grave apprehension the provisions of the Bills of Mr. Leatham and the Archbishop of Canterbury referring to the prohibition of the sale of advowsons, as involving a confiscatory character; they reminded the House that a large number of advowsons had within the last fifteen years been purchased from the Lord Chancellor, under the special Act allowing those sales, and that the prices given for them had ranged from three and a half to twelve years' purchase of the net incomes, although the incomes of most of their benefices were increased by the addition of interest arising from the purchase money. The petitioners had proof that the selling value of advowsons by private treaty had within the last few years ranged between three and nine years' purchase subject to lives in possession, and from nine to twelve years' purchase with the prospect of immediate possession. The petitioners ventured to think that the House of Laymen, having these facts before them, would not recommend any course which would confiscate wholly or in part the property of private patrons. The petitioners suggested that advowsons could only be dealt with honourably in two ways, either (1) to prohibit absolutely the sale of advowsons to private individuals, subject to full and adequate compensation securely provided for, as upon the sale of a lay property required under any public improvement, or (2) to allow the sale of advowsons without any restrictions.

A NONCONFORMIST minister at Bridport having stated that the noble earl had described the endowments of the Church as State property, Lord Selborne has written a letter to an elector of that town on the subject. He says:—"Nothing can possibly be more contrary to the fact than to represent me as having ever said or thought that the endowments of the Church of England are State or national property, or that they can justly be taken away by Parliament. I am, and always have been, of exactly the contrary opinion. Unless for some just cause of forfeiture, I hold that they could no more be taken away from that large part of the people which (under ancient and legal titles—not even originally conferred by any public act of the State) is now in practical enjoyment of them, than any property held in trust under the

protection of public law for the religious purposes of any Nonconformist denomination could be."

THE commission appointed by the Archbishop to inquire as to what alterations for ecclesiastical purposes may best be made with regard to the benefices in Canterbury, has presented its report, recommending the union of different parishes, and the closing of several of the churches, which, however, are to be retained for the present as Mission-rooms, pending the obtaining of a special Act of Parliament to enable the authorities to deal with the buildings. Various recommendations are made for the augmentation of the poorer livings, such as the appropriation of the surplus revenues of the Chapter now received by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; the income received by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners from use of the Canterbury parishes beyond the sums paid by them annually to the incumbents of the same; and the suppression of one of the canonries. This last suggestion is regarded as the essence of the report, and it has the approval of the Dean and the Bishop of Dover, who were both on the commission.

THE important living of Stepney, the mother-church of East London, has been offered by the Bishop of Bedford to the Rev. Edwin Hoskyns, vicar of St. Clement's, Notting Hill, and has been accepted by him.

THE Bishop of Salisbury has appointed Mr. C. W. Holgate, of Brasenose and Lincoln's Inn, barrister, to be his resident legal secretary. He will go into residence at the Palace after Trinity Sunday, from which date all letters relating to diocesan business usually addressed to Mr. Hassard in London, or Mr. Hodding at Salisbury, should be addressed to Mr. Holgate.

THE will has been proved of Archbishop Trench, the personalty being sworn at £80,612. The most rev. prelate devises his interest in all lands to which he was entitled by his father's will, as well as by the will of Madame Ingri Christine St. George, together with all property which had been purchased by him, to his widow and children, in separate portions. He also devises £1,000 for charitable purposes to be applied by Mrs. Trench in whatever manner she may think fit; and £3,000 upon trust for the benefit of any bishopric, living, or institution in connection with the Church of Ireland, to be expended in such manner as the trustees (Mr. T. C. Trench, Colonel Trench, and Mr. Cholmley Austen Leigh) may think fit.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Badnall, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D., late of Capetown; Vicar of Fishlake.
Beilby, Rev. George, M.A., Rector of Street.
Boyes, Rev. D. L., Senior Assistant Curate of Welshpool; Incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, Melrose, N.B.
Burney, Rev. Henry Bannerman, M.A., Rural Dean of Midsomer Norton.
Champneys, Rev. Weldon, M.A., Vicar of Haslingden, Rural Dean, Proctor in Convocation; Honorary Canon of Manchester Cathedral.
Dawson, Rev. H. Leyland, M.A., Curate of Helmsley, Yorkshire.
De Fraine, Rev. George Henry, LL.B., Vicar of Stoke Lane, Somersetshire.
Grundy, Rev. John, Chaplain of the Blackburn Union Workhouse.
Hensley, Rev. Henry Gabriel, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Taunton.
Hoskyns, Rev. Edwin, Vicar of St. Clement's, Notting Hill; Rector of Stepney.
Jungbluth, Rev. Walter, J.W.G., A.K.C., Curate of Christ Church, Leeds; Vicar of Mytholmroyd, Yorks.
Lloyd, Rev. Julius, Rector of St. Anne's, Manchester; Honorary Canon of Manchester Cathedral.
Lowe, Rev. Adam, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Matlock Bank.
Manning, Rev. Dr., Rector of St. Leonard's, Colchester; Rector of Fairstead.
Maude, Rev. C. F., Rector of Woodham Mortimer; Rector of St. James's, Colchester.
Miller, Rev. Norman J., Vicar of Garton-in-Holderness.
Newling, Rev. William Edgar, B.A., Vicar of Llandown.
Poyntz, Rev. Nathaniel C. S., Curate of St. Bartholomew-the-Great, West Smithfield; Vicar of Dorchester, near Wallingford.
Roberts, Rev. Robert Jones, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Pool Quay.
Snape, Rev. Richard Herbert, Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Towle, Rev. C. S., Vicar of Moordown, near Bournemouth; Vicar of St. Mary's, Charterhouse.
Uppleby, Rev. George Crowle, Vicar of Corringham, Lincolnshire.
Wallis, Rev. Frederic, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury.
Walters, Rev. Frank B., Fellow of Queen's, Cambridge; Principal of King William's, College, Isle of Man.
Welburn, Rev. F. W., Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Wiltshire.
Wheeler, Rev. David, M.A., Chaplain of the West of England Sanatorium.
Wilcox, Rev. Charles Byron, Vicar of Euston, Normanby; Vicar of St. Jude's, Moorfields, Sheffield.
Wills, Rev. John Philip, B.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Wright, Rev. C. Sisum, Vicar of Doncaster and Canon of York; Rector of Stokesley.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Crockett. Rev. Robert Princep, Vicar of Christ Church, Eccleston, at Eccleston, Prescott, on the 4th inst.

Holmes, Rev. Edward Adolphus, M.A., F.L.S., for fifty-three years Rector of Harleston, at St. Margaret's Rectory, Harleston, on the 31st ult.

Holmes, Rev. Charles Joseph Greame, B.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, lately Curate of Downham Market, and eldest son of the Rev. Joseph Holmes, Vicar of Swineshead, at Swineshead Vicarage, Lincolnshire, on the 31st ult., in his 28th year.

Jenkyns, Rev. Richard, Rector of Wallsend, Northumberland, at Botley Hill, Southampton, on the 6th inst., aged 44,

Lohr, Rev. Charles William Haukes, lately Curate of St. Breage, Cornwall, at Alburgh Rectory, Harleston, Norfolk, on the 8th inst., aged 28.

Moule, Rev. Horatio, M.A., Rector of Road-cum-Woolverton, and formerly Senior Chaplain of the Cathedral, Calcutta, on the 3rd inst., aged 80.

O'Grady, Rev. Edward George, late Vicar of Mungret, diocese of Limerick, third son of D. O'Grady, Esq., D.L., Aghamarta Castle, county Cork, at Bournemouth, on the 3rd inst.

Ridgway, Rev. James Barnes, at the Clergy House of Rest, West Malvern, on the 5th inst., aged 34.

Robinson, Rev. William Kay, Rector of Walwyn's Castle with Robertson West, at Walwyn's Castle Rectory, on the 16th ult., aged 85.

Watson, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Rector of Great and Little Wigborough, at the Rectory, on the 28th ult., aged 55.

Wayman, Rev. William, for fifty years Vicar of Great Thurlow, at Great Thurlow Vicarage, on the 1st inst., aged 76.

White, Rev. W. K., at Harbour Briton Rectory, Newfoundland, on the 29th ult.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE HOME AND THE FAMILY.

By the BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN.

Jubilee Sermon of the Pastoral Aid Society, Preached at Manchester, October 20th, 1885.

"Then said he, What have they seen in thine house."—Isaiah xxxix. 4.

IF I read the Word of God aright, my brethren, I certainly find that next in importance to the salvation of one's own soul come the duties and responsibilities of family religion. The order is plain. A man must see, in the first instance, to the salvation of his own soul. There is no selfishness in this; it is a necessity; for until a man has been blessed by God in his own soul he never will be a blessing to others. But when once he has accepted the salvation of God, when once he has been blessed from Heaven, he is bound to be a blessing to all with whom he has to do. The candlestick must receive the light; and not put it under a bushel, but give light unto all.

And so with the Christian. He first receives a blessing from God, and then he is made a blessing to all with whom he has to do. And that blessing begins in the household and family. "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." "Himself believed, and his whole house."

And you will understand the words "thine house" if you remember that the home, the household, and the family is the place where we have the opportunity of glorifying God as we have nowhere else in the world. We go out into the world, and meet with strangers, with people who care little or nothing about us, and we care little or nothing about them. But in the home it is different. Everybody knows us; our fathers and mothers know us, our brothers and sisters know us, the servants know us. They watch everything we do, they listen to everything we say, and thus they are able to appreciate all that God does with us, and for us, and by us. There is an opportunity in the home, therefore, of glorifying God that we shall find nowhere else in the world.

And thus no doubt it was that when our blessed Lord had cast out the devils from the young man, and he naturally besought Christ that he might remain with Him, and be His companion in His after life and ministry, though our blessed Lord answered the prayer of the devils, and answered the prayer of the Gadarenes, "that He should depart from them," He refused to grant the request of the young man; and "howbeit Jesus suffered it not; and said, "Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done to thee, and hath had compassion on thee."

But not only is the home a place where we have an opportunity of glorifying God as we have nowhere else; it is also the place where the strongest obligation rests upon us to glorify God. Those who make up the home, and the household, and the family, who are united by the closest and dearest ties, by the relationship of love, they have the strongest claim upon us, if we know the Lord Jesus, to let them know the Saviour Whom we have learned to love. Never tell me a man loves me if he will do nothing for my soul. Shall a man let me go down the broad road that leads to destruction, and never put his hand upon my shoulder, and say, "Brother, Christ died for you"? How was shown the love of Heaven? Was it not that this world was lost and undone; and that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life"? If, then, the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost that is given to us, surely it will manifest itself in this way—in leading those whom we love to the Saviour Whom we have found.

And thus it was with the apostles of old. When Andrew listened to the Baptist's voice, "Behold the Lamb of God, that beareth away the sins of the world;" when he came to know the Saviour, what did he do? "He first findeth his own brother," and he never left him until he had brought him to Jesus.

But as the home is the place where we have the opportunity of glorifying God, as the home is the place where this obligation rests upon us, so the home also is the place where the grace of God peculiarly fits us to fulfil the relationships of life. Wherever we are, or whatever we are obliged to do for God, He will give us the grace to accomplish it. God's biddings are God's enablings; God's commands are our strength. But whilst this is true, it is also true in a peculiar sense in connection with the home, the household, and the family, that the grace of God fits us to fulfil the relationships that they delight in. Look at the Epistle to the Ephesians. In this St. Paul puts before us the very highest object, and he shows us how the grace of God finds the sinner "dead in trespasses and sins," brings him into living union with Christ, and makes us "sit together with Christ in heavenly places." Can you have a plainer doctrine than that? The practical teaching of that Epistle is that we have a duty as husbands, wives, parents, children, masters, and servants. The grace of God sets us in the home to do the work of God in life. We all want to do something out of the common in the world; but depend upon it, God wants us to subdue temper, and overcome

evil habits. We may in this aspect understand at once how such a solemn question should come from God: "What have they seen in thine house?"

But let me remind you of the circumstances under which the question was asked. Of all the kings that sat upon the throne of Judah none perhaps was more upright than King Hezekiah. He came to the throne at an early age, but from the moment he began to reign he showed he was a decided servant of God. He banished idolatry from the land; took the brazen serpent which the people had been worshipping, "and he called it Nehushtan." And thus he was a man who honoured Jehovah alone as God. But he was laid upon a bed of sickness, and God told him it should be a bed of death. He turned his face to the wall, and prayed God to prolong his life. Whether it was right or wise in him to do this is a question. I know that some would say it is perfectly right. I would only remind you that when his prayer was answered, in the after part of his life he sinned the great sin of his life. I would rather say that it is our duty to make Christ's prayer ours: "Not my will, but Thine be done." But however this may be, the Lord answered Hezekiah's prayer: "Behold, I will add unto thy days fifteen years." Well, however exemplary the former years of his life may have been, he should have felt that now his life should indeed be exemplary. Coming forth as by a resurrection he should have felt: "Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling. I will walk before the Lord in the land of the living." Whatever his former life might have been, these fifteen years that God gave him we should hope would be the best of all. But how different was it! No sooner had he been raised up by God from the bed of sickness than he received a visit from the ambassadors of the king of Babylon, who came to congratulate him upon his recovery. And here was a grand opportunity for Hezekiah to show these men what God had done for him, and show the power of the God of Israel. But when these men came Hezekiah took them round his kingdom and showed them all his power, and wealth, and armies—all the grandeur of his kingdom—and sent them away. No sooner had they gone than the prophet of the Lord came to King Hezekiah, and said, "Who were these men?" "They are come from Babylon; the ambassadors of the king." "What did they see in thine house?" Not, What did they see in thy kingdom of thy greatness, power, and wealth, but "What did they see in thine house?" It is in the house that a man is known, in his home, in his family. We can be very good people out in the world, where people do not know us; but it is in the home, the household, and the family that a man is known. God said, "What have they seen in thine house?" And judgment fell, not upon King Hezekiah himself, but judgment was pronounced on his house and his posterity.

Dear friends, this is a very solemn teaching, that I feel should come home to us in these days. For it seems to me that the home does not occupy that place in men's hearts and minds that it used to occupy, or that it ought to do. The home should be the sanctuary of a man's life. All he has, and all he is, should be made to minister unto it. There his character is formed; his conduct is seen, and known, and appreciated; there he is able to manifest the grace of God. It is in the home, the household, and the family that he spends the greater portion of his life; and it is from the home that he will most probably go forth one day on his last long journey. In the home, I say, unless it is not what it used to be and what it ought to be, a man's character is formed. And, dear friends, believe me, the home lies at the foundation of all England's social greatness, at the base of the fabric which has made England what it is. Contrast England with the other nations of the world, with our French neighbours; they have no name for "home." They could not translate that word of ours into their language.

But the home is not in England what it was; and the home should be seen to. And men should make all their first friendships there; they go out into the world, and to business, and turn their backs upon home; and the mother and daughters too often go forth for amusement, or for what they would call "work." The children are sent to school to be got rid of; the servants are not treated as we are taught in the Word of God to treat our servants. There is no family prayer, there is not the reading and study of the Word of God. There is not the holy conversation which I find in Scripture marking the homes of old. Now, dear friends, you know as well as I do that this is too much the case. And I make bold to appeal to you this afternoon in connection with the Society which has for its object Home Mission work. Surely if we are to carry out Home Missions we must begin in the home, the household, and the family. We must see that our homes are pure, that God is owned there, that the worship of God is set up. It is of no use to go into the streets; begin first with the individual, plead with men for their souls; and then go into the home, into the household, into the family, and see that these are what they should be.

And now let me ask you to bear in mind three important things. If we are to have our homes what they should be, I say distinctly, and at once, that we must be determined, come what may, to have God owned in the home. There is no use in any half-and-half measures; you must set up the worship of God in the home, the household, and the family, and show that you are decided, at all costs, to have God honoured in your homes. Joshua, the great warrior of Israel, gathered his

men around him in his old age, when he felt that his days were coming to a close, and put before them the whole matter. He set before them the faithfulness of God; at the same time he pointed out the temptations connected with the idolatry of the surrounding nations, and he said: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." There is no central position. Our Lord Himself said: "He that is not with Me is against Me; he that gathereth not with Me scattereth abroad." There can be no neutral position; you must either be on God's side, or you must be against Him. And so Joshua said: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve; as for me I have made up my mind; and my house will serve the Lord." And this is what God hopes for. Remember what He said of Abraham: "I know Abraham. I know Abraham; that he will command his children, and his household after him, to keep My commandments."

Here is the first thing we have to lay to heart. If the home is to be for the glory of God we must begin and determine, come what may, God shall be honoured there.

And the next thing I would put before you is this: that the home below must be made a reflection of the home above; a home kindred with the description given us of the homes of old. None, I take it, is more blessed than that which is given by our blessed Lord Himself, when He says: "My Father's house." Oh! how blessed to think of the home above, and of that time when the ties of earth are breaking, when the home is breaking up, when one dear one after another passes away, to realise there is a home above, and that home is my Father's house, with all its associations, with all its affections, with all its vicissitudes, with all its gatherings—above all, with its preparation! For Christ, as He speaks of "My Father's house," says, "I go to prepare a place for you." And when He has prepared that place for us, and we are prepared for that place, then He comes to take His people to Himself. How blessed to remember that—"My Father's house"! And we, in the preparation we make at home, should seek to make our homes a reflection of the home above. It was said that the man of faith, "when warned by God of things not seen as yet," Noah of old, "prepared the ark for the saving of his house." Not for himself alone. Here, then, we are taught that we should prepare for a home above: and the preparation should consist of thus making the home below a reflection of the home yonder.

Last of all, I say in connection with this subject, that we must bear in mind that perhaps the most bitter subject of regret when we come to die, and to pass into the other world, will be our neglect of home. I read in the Bible of a holy, good man, a man after God's own heart, but who had sinned in his home, and a man whom, therefore, God punished in his home; that God forgave him, and restored him, and blessed him; but when he came to die the one thing alone that cast a shadow over the peaceful, bright hopes of David's house was the home. "Although my house be not so with God." Oh, how sad to consider that that was just the one thing that cast a shadow over the close of that good man's life!

But it is not only of the close of life here, it is in the other world that the regret will be so terrible. Our blessed Lord has drawn the curtain aside and let us peep into the other world. He tells us of the rich man "who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day." And this rich man, who had such great opportunities of doing good to others and to himself, "died and was buried." "And in hell,"—these are not my words; there are people nowadays who do not believe in hell, but I am giving you now the words of my Lord and Master,—"in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." And he sought, in the first instance, to have relief for himself, but it was impossible, even if Abraham had wished it. "There was a great gulf fixed." And then, when he saw there could be no relief for himself, "he said, I pray thee, then, father that thou wouldst send him to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may testify to them, lest they come also into this place of torment."

Oh, how terrible the regret when he found that he could receive no relief for himself! He had neglected his own soul, and himself, in the world; he had lived, but he had neglected his house, he had neglected those in his home. And then he felt regret amid all the bitterness and anguish of his own soul: "I pray thee, therefore, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house, for I have five brethren; that he may testify to them, lest they come also into this place of torment."

Dear friends, there are few subjects more solemn than this, few that call for the attention of the people of England more than this at the present moment. The question comes from the God of heaven to every one of us: "What have they seen in thine house?" Is it drink? Drink that is ruining many a home in England; drink, that is dragging many and many a soul down into hell? Be honest; out with the unclean spirit if it is. For this question comes from God: "What have they seen in thine house?"

Is it gambling? Many a home is ruined by gambling, by betting, by speculation of all kinds? Wise men tell us that we may cure a drunkard, but never a gambler. Oh! but the grace of God can do all things. I would never say that any soul cannot be saved by the power of God's grace. But we must look to it, and be honest in this respect.

"What have they seen in thine house?" Is it moral impurity, vice? Vice that is staining your own

character, and the character of those you love? You do not like to confess it, to acknowledge it; you try to cover it; but oh! do not. God says:

"What have they seen in thine house?" God had not only His ordinance for cleansing the leper, He had also His ordinance for cleansing the house of leprosy. And so we can do with every house and every home amongst ourselves.

"What have they seen in thine house?" What God looks for is the blood on the doorposts of all our houses, and for the feeding on the Lamb within. And God often looks for it in vain. Where the blood is there is the life, and where there is feeding on the Lamb there is peace and blessing.

"What have they seen in thine house?" Will you seek first the kingdom of God for yourself? Will you do your utmost to set up the worship and fear of God in the home, the household, and the family? And, last of all, will you help us in our work of going into the homes of the people, that there the worship of God may be set up, and that souls may be won for Christ?

## LAW, PROGRESS AND CITIZENSHIP.

By the Rev. GEORGE BLADON, B.A., Curate of Penwortham, Preston.

Sermon to be Preached at Penwortham on the Queen's Accession, June 20th, 1886.

"Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."—Eph. ii. 19.

WHEN Wordsworth drew his picture of the happy warrior, and asked, "Who is the happy warrior? Who is he that every man in arms should wish to be?" he answered his own question by describing him, first, as one "whose law is reason, who depends upon that law as on the best of friends." That is the foundation—law according to reason—a *reasonable* law, and on that foundation, Wordsworth describes the happy warrior as thus building:—"He labours good on good to fix." And so stability and progress are combined; but Wordsworth knew (few knew it better) how much progress depends on personal character. The happy warrior not only "labours good on good to fix," but "owes to virtue every triumph that he knows; who, if he rise to station of command, rises by open means; and there will stand on honourable terms or else retire; who understands his trust, and to the same keeps faithful with a singleness of aim; and therefore does not stoop nor lie in wait for wealth or honour, or for worldly state." Thus the happy warrior, as painted by Wordsworth, keeps three duties ever in view; first, that of maintaining law and order, in agreement wherewith all his actions must be done. Secondly, progress; good continually added to good. And thirdly, and far the most important duty of all, that of maintaining a character void of offence both towards God and towards man—a character of unspotted virtue, of untarnished honour, of unbending faithfulness.

Now, let us see how well this agrees with St. Paul's picture of the Christian as he should be. St. Paul does not, in the passage we have chosen for our text, compare the Christian to a warrior, though he very often does—in fact, he does so in this very epistle—but he compares him to a citizen and a householder. The true Christian is a citizen of the New Jerusalem—the city come down from God out of heaven—the true Church. And in that true Church, although it is a city, yet there are no party strifes, no contentions, no jealousies, nothing enters into that city which maketh a lie; in it there is perfect unity; one God is Father of all, whom all look up to and love; one is Lord of all, Jesus Christ, and Him do all obey; and with one Spirit all are filled, and all work together in unity of purpose and in singleness of aim.

And just as we saw that the happy warrior had three things ever to keep in view—law and order, as the foundation of all; progress, and the honour and perfecting of his own character; so we may see that St. Paul holds the same three essentials before the Christian citizen and the Christian householder. There is, first, the foundation—law and order according to reason—the apostles and prophets building up the Church upon Jesus Christ, the corner-stone. That law is the perfect law of liberty, the law of obedience to Jesus Christ—"If ye love Me, keep my commandments," "If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily and follow Me"—that is the *law* for all, and the *order* for all is the apostolic order of discipline and united work—not of enjoyment and profit, but of discipline and united work; just as St. Paul puts it a little later on in this same Epistle:—"And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ, till we all come unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

And these words lead us naturally on from that first requisite both for the happy warrior and for the Christian citizen and householder—a good foundation; to the second, which is progress. That "perfecting of the saints," and that "building up of the body of Christ," of which St. Paul speaks, is something which each one of us, according to our opportunity and ability,

must work for, and as it is in the Church, so is it also in the State. No progress, no safety; or let us put it as Lord Bacon puts it in his "Essays"—an authority which few will venture to despise—"Surely every medicine is an innovation, and he that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator, and if time of course alters things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them for the better, what shall be the end?" For the nation is but the individual man "writ large," and men are like trees; either they are growing or else they are dying, since there is no such thing as standing still anywhere in nature. Even things originally good become in time, first unsuitable, and then, unless so duly altered and amended as to again become suitable, they become absolutely harmful. There are no truer words than those oft-quoted lines of Tennyson's: "The old order changeth, giving place to new, and God fulfils Himself in many ways, lest one *good* custom should corrupt the world." Even *good* customs may become bad—the things suitable for childhood are not so for youth; what is best for youth may be even bad for the full-grown man, and in old age men must gradually change until the last final change renders further earthly change impossible. The Bible itself teaches us the need for changes of this kind. To the Patriarchs God gave promises splendid, noble, and encouraging; not till 400 years after did the law enter in; and even that was but a schoolmaster to lead men to Christ; it was just because the Jews would not see this, but, in folly and blindness, thought to make their law perpetual, that when Christ came they rejected Him and crucified Him.

But the third, and far the most important part of the portrait of the happy warrior is his untarnished honour, his unsullied virtue, his unswerving faithfulness, the singleness of his aim, the unworldliness of his desires, the goodness of his character; and so St. Paul describes the Christian citizen and householder in our text, as one who is fitting himself to be "an habitation of God through the Spirit." Or in other words the Christian citizen is the man in whom dwells the Holy Spirit of God, and who has therefore the mind of Christ. And what kind of man will this be? Do not let *us*, at any rate, fall into the old, but still sadly too common, error of thinking it consists in holding right opinions. What use are right opinions except to be a foundation for right action? "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall inherit the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven." There were those in St. Paul's day who boasted of the correctness of their opinions, but whom for all that St. Paul plainly described as enemies of the Cross of Christ; and so, in the present day, in spite of their boasted orthodoxy, in spite of their large subscriptions, in spite of their ready favour and applause, by far the most dangerous enemies of the Establishment, are not the members of the Liberation Society, nor the political Dissenters of any class, still less are they open and avowed Atheists, but *her own inconsistent members*, who neither live according to her teaching themselves, and the persons who would they hinder by their loose and indifferent talk, and still more, by the influence of their bad and careless example. And as it is in the Church, so also is it in the State. The good citizen is not the man who votes straight, but the man who fulfils his duties; and the more duties men fulfil, the better citizens they are; but it is astonishing how few recognise this. There are men who can hardly find words to abuse the want of honesty displayed by their political opponents, who yet are not ashamed to cheat the tax-collector — perhaps in the matter of income-tax, perhaps in some other way,—totally forgetful of the fact that such conduct is simply robbery, neither more nor less. Now, St. Paul not only requires the Christian citizen to be an honest man—the very heathen knew that honesty was one of the virtues—but gives an additional reason why he should be honest: "Let him that stole steal no more, but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." And again: "Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour, for we are members one of another." Thus the frauds by which the very honour of the country is tainted, and its commerce checked—for who will bargain with a man whom he suspects to be a thief if he can possibly help it?—and the lying advertisements with which the columns of our newspapers are full, are all in direct disobedience to our Christian citizenship, and are directly contradictory to St. Paul's words, "members one of another."

But St. Paul goes closer still to the very root of good citizenship—family life. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives." "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church; therefore as the Church is subject to Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything." "Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right." "And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but as the servants o

Christ, doing the will of God from the heart, with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men."

That is family life as it ought to be, and as it would be if the spirit of St. Paul's commands were obeyed. The commands themselves, indeed, are not new—we find them in the Old Testament, we find them even in the writings of the wise heathens of old—but the reasons are, and the spirit in which they must be obeyed is. It would make all the difference to family life if husbands loved their wives as Christ did the Church—to raise them, that is, to teach them, to help them, to be to them, as far as man can be, all that Christ is to the Church. It would make all the difference if children were brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," learning to fear God and keep His commandments, knowing therefore no other fear. It would make all the difference, I say; for a nation of families, all of them righteous, would be a righteous nation, and righteousness—not wealth, nor great armies, nor much territory, but righteousness—exalteth a nation.

And a nation being exalted by righteousness must prosper—must prosper, for there is no sillier cry than the cry that bad Governments are the hindrance to our prosperity. It was when Nero was Emperor—Nero, whose very name is almost a proverb of wickedness—that St. Paul wrote: "For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou, then, not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same." St. Paul knew what we in our boasted wisdom do not know, that the best of laws and the best of governments avail nothing for an ungodly people, and that if the people be godly, it matters little who makes their laws, or how. But a people fearing God and loving righteousness will be troubled by bad laws or bad governments, but seldom, or at any rate not for long. While, then, we pray, and rightly pray, for our Queen, for the ministers, for parliaments, and those in authority, yet let us remember that much less upon them than on ourselves does our prosperity depend. We are already citizens of the kingdom of Heaven, and householders in the family of God; only by doing our duties as such can we make our nation prosperous, and hasten the glorious time when the many kingdoms of this world shall become the one kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever.

THE *Gloucester Chronicle* says it is stated that the Rev. C. J. Thompson, vicar of Cardiff, has been asked to accept the bishopric of Melbourne, in succession to Dr. Moorhouse. Mr. Thompson has done a great work at Cardiff, and is one of the most eloquent preachers in the neighbourhood. His health has suffered from the large amount of work entailed upon the vicar of a parish like St. John, and he desires a little rest, and the bracing climate of Australia he considers will be beneficial to him.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1886.

## HOME RULE.

LAST week we showed that Mr. Gladstone had taken up the great cause of Home Rule as a political strategist, in order to get himself back again into office as Prime Minister. It is, however, right that we should acknowledge that he is largely responsible both directly and indirectly for the existence of this Home Rule problem. His extension of household suffrage to the peasantry in the Irish counties assuredly gave to Mr. Parnell the eighty-six supporters which are admitted to have suddenly converted the old Parliamentary hand. Certainly Mr. Gladstone never made the smallest attempt to reconcile Ireland to the Parliamentary or Paper Union, as he now calls it, by treating her as an integral part of the State, having equal claims with England and Scotland. Unlike Lords Palmerston and Beaconsfield, he has never welcomed her representatives to the national councils, or entrusted them with a fair share of executive work. He insulted the majority of her people by his factitious railings against Vaticanism, and he would sooner have burnt off his right hand than have gratified the progressive minority by appointing one of her many learned and accomplished divines to an English bishopric. His policy in regard to Ireland has been identical with his policy on most other subjects—the policy of not taking up any reform while its supporters are in a minority. He has never maintained and justified any unpopular principle, or championed any great English cause, until it became a matter of political life and death to him to do so. There is no reform with which he is associated that he did not long oppose, and then came forward in the long-run to snatch the credit of other men's work. This policy applied to Ireland has indirectly contributed to Home Rule. He is the miraculous prestidigitator who gradually confirmed Ireland in hatred of the Union, and now claims gratitude from her and from England by conceding the separation which he, and he alone, has made almost inevitable. Like other opportunists, our Prime Minister seems to have little or no forethought, or he would have made some effort to have prevented this agitation, and moreover he would have known that his scheme

of Home Rule was an impossible one. The million and a quarter of Protestants will not submit to it; and as our correspondent Mr. Lawrence points out, the Belfast riots demonstrate that a Protestant mob is able to drive a large body of Papist constabulary to seek the shelter of their barracks. The intelligence, energy, and courage of the Protestant artisans is such that they can never be subjugated to a Papist Parliament of professional agitators; so that, in order to make Mr. Gladstone's scheme practicable, they as well as the landlords will have to be bought out by the English taxpayer. A better remedy is Lord Salisbury's and Lord Hartington's, viz., a disregard of mercenary agitators, and a steady coercion of the Ten Commandments for twenty years. "Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness remain in the fruitful field. And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance for ever."

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY presided at the annual meetings of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the National Society, bearing testimony to the value and success of their work. At the conference in connection with the latter society, presided over by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, there was an interesting discussion on free schools. Mr. Hobson, the Principal of St. Katherine's, gave some much-needed advice in support of the present pupil-teacher system, which head teachers are anxious to abolish, preferring something more mechanical.

THE BISHOP OF ELY presided at his first diocesan conference on Wednesday. Speaking of the hours of marriage, Lord Alwyne Compton said he had given directions for all licences to be made out extending the time to three o'clock; in regard to marriages by banns, the fixing of the hour, he said, rested with the clergy. A motion in favour of allowing the sale of glebe lands was carried by 57 to 32.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER (Dr. E. Bickersteth), in his primary address, deals mainly with the pastoral work of the diocese—asking us as to hours of celebration and matters of ritual not to judge one another. "Prosecutions seemed to him only to aggravate the evil they were meant to suppress."

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### FREE TRADE.

SIR,—I do not know whether your correspondent, Mr. Sandlands, does or does not expect me to remark on his letter of date 5th, and I doubt if it would be interesting to your readers in general that this discussion should be pursued. Accordingly, I am not desirous of this appearing in your paper leaving that to you.

"Free Trade is practicable under impossible conditions." I contradict flatly that the conditions are impossible. In other words, I say that it is possible, nay, that it is very practicable, for every Government in the world to replace indirect by direct taxation.

I said in a former letter, that certain industries with which I am almost immediately acquainted are at this moment in a good condition. Your correspondent asked what they are, and I told him. He attempted to ridicule the notion of the trades that I spoke of being trades at all. Knowing what I was writing about (a thing the importance of which Mr. Sandlands seems not to have grasped) I gave some information concerning those trades. Now I am told that what I say is not to the point. If so, what was the use of asking the question?

I gave, in my letter of date 5th, not an explanation "of the principle which is responsible for all our ills," but a statement of the ultimate economic action of the scarcity (comparatively to what it was) of gold on prices in general. I am not surprised that your correspondent can make nothing of my explanation. "I have given you a reason," said Dr. Johnson; "I cannot give you——" *vide* Boswell for what the doctor could not give. In a former letter of Mr. Sandlands', he spoke of the action of demand and supply in connection with a matter towards which that action has no relation. He says that I ignored his position. I no doubt did, as a general attacking an enemy takes no account of any position which that enemy may hold at such a distance as makes it incapable of affecting the issue of the battle. But the fact of the diminished supply of gold having lowered prices has everything to do with my reference to the law of supply and demand.

Mr. Sandlands says that I have not produced a single rational argument in advocacy of my contention. Let me refer to one or two of his arguments. In his letter of 22nd May I find:—"Living costs much in England; it costs little on the Continent. The products of labour on the Continent will, in consequence, be less costly." Now, England exports a greater amount of the products of that kind universally enumerated as manufactured, than the whole Continent put together; and the people who buy these products buy them because they are cheaper than they can get them from the Continent. Continental manufacturers make some things cheaper than we do; but, on the whole, we beat them. The statement that I put in inverted commas is plainly made without knowledge or without thought, or without either. Again, in letter of date May 8th: "'B' asserted that to tax articles meant to increase the price to the consumer. I showed that his contention was absurd. He should have dealt with my facts. To make assertions advances nothing." To make an assertion of a matter of fact, known to all persons acquainted with trade, the reason and necessity of the fact being perfectly plain to them, may advance nothing, but it should settle a good deal. As for Mr. Sandlands' facts, I am unable to deal with things that do not exist.

My letters do not, I confidently hope, contain any argumentation of the above kind. If, as reasoning, those letters are deficient, why, I must only try to learn to express myself better.

Your correspondent appears to regard illustrations taken from the functions of the conic sections as not

modest; an idea which he will find skilfully put forward in that amusing poem "The Loves of the Triangles." He will not, I suppose, object to an illustration taken from the fifth proposition of the first book of Euclid, commonly called the Ass's Bridge. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to prove the truth of that proposition to one who did not know first what an isoceles triangle is. Any real want of modesty that there may be in these premises does appear to me to reside in the person who thinks he knows something of the subject, and knows nothing.

B.

14th June, 1886.

[This discussion must now close.—ED.]

## BELFAST RIOTS.

SIR,—The condition of this town during last night brings to mind what, on a larger scale, London must have been during the Gordon riots. A large mob, of the Protestant religion, attacked the police stationed to prevent the passage of crowds of excited persons from one district of the town to another. The police resisted, first with bayonet charges, then by firing; but being overborne, and being apparently less determined than the mob, they took refuge in one of their barracks, and sent for the military. The mob cheered the military, ceased active operations, and after a while went home to bed. While the police, to the number it is said of a hundred and fifty, were being besieged in the barracks, they and the mob exchanged shots, with some loss of life; while the outlying portions of the crowd amused themselves with gutting and burning the houses of obnoxious Roman Catholic publicans.

This is the condition, and the like has been so, more or less, since Friday last, in a large portion of Belfast, a town noted for ferocious religious riots, and which now surpasses itself. I am of opinion that the "rough" element is a small one in these abominations; I believe that party animosity is at the root of them. The common people of the Protestants here, universally or nearly so, think that the police are all Papists, and their enemies. This accounts for their animosity and for their audacity; for the ordinary Protestant of the North of Ireland believes all Papists to be cowards. General respect for their fighting capacity will not be much increased by what occurred last night, when 150 of them retreated before the mob, and took refuge under cover.

I do not think that the philosophy of these riots can be properly understood without reference to former ones, and to what followed on them. There is here much outcry by the orderly inhabitants of the town at the want of preparedness of the authorities, knowing as they did, or should know, the inflammable state of the population. All preparation that could have been made must have been the introduction of a greater force; I do not think that any blame is attachable on this ground; I look farther into the matter. The usual number of constabulary in Belfast is about seven hundred; ample, one might suppose, for all emergencies. But the composition of this force is not such as makes it, even in ordinary times and for ordinary purposes of administration, an effective one.

Those whose memories carry them so far back, know that in 1864 there were riots in Belfast of the same kind as the present riots. At that time, there were in the town two police forces; one of about 150 men, under the corporation; the ordinary duties of which were those of any civic force, that is, the care of the streets, night watching, &c.; and an equal number or thereabouts of constabulary, who were called on to assist the others when the peace was at all menaced. The corporation, at that period (as their successors are now), were nearly all Tories; and the Roman Catholic mob looked with enmity on the local force. Between the two forces, an utter failure to maintain decent order occurred in 1864. A commission of enquiry reported in favour of abolishing the corporation police, replacing them with constabulary, the town to bear the cost of the increased number of the latter. This plan, after some bargaining between the corporation and the government about how much the town should pay, was carried out, to general satisfaction, and with a general hope that the town would be peaceful in future. I need not say that this hope has not been realised. Belfast is in common times orderly enough, but every one knows that riots like the present are its chronic disease.

It was not considered that the duties of the constabulary of Ireland in general, are semi-military; and that the habits of such a force are not the habits that could make them the efficient administrators of the duties of a civic police. A number of men are drafted from time to time from the country, who never were for a week together in a large town. Their notions of keeping order are taken from their experience at the fairs held in villages; they have no local knowledge, and no knowledge of the people. Many Belfast people will contradict me, but I am very decidedly of opinion that the constabulary have turned out a most inefficient police for that town. I am not blaming them for this; after I had observed them for a twelvemonth, I came to the conclusion that it could not be otherwise. Belfast, like Dublin, ought to have a local police of its own, organised on a metropolitan model.

Another mischief has followed the institution. The old Corporation police were looked on as enemies by the Roman Catholic mob. With as much, or as little, reason, the constabulary are looked on as enemies by the Protestant mob. No force can be effective in maintaining order under such circumstances, with one-half or one-fourth of the success that one would have which should be unappealably beyond such imputations. I say nothing of present political feeling; it exasperates, but it has not, save as immediate cause, produced these riots.

I dare say that the account I give of the actual battle last night is open to correction; very few even actors in a battle give exactly the same reports of it. I do not think it very much matters "who fired the first shot." My object is to give a general view of the permanent condition of Belfast affairs.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

Belfast, June 10th, 1886.

## THE CRISIS.

SIR,—During the last eventful year, there have been occasions to which the term "eventful crisis" has been applied rightly; but I leave it to "Historicus" to say whether he will not think soberly and talk rationally

and call the pending election *the* crisis in our national history. Some years ago, a number of clergy—disgusted with Lord Beaconsfield and believing in the present Premier as the regenerator of England and England's Church—worked as one man to restore Mr. Gladstone to power. Whether Liberals or Conservatives, they have seen some of the finest intellects in Parliament prefer principle to place. The clergy are "preachers of righteousness" in the sense of rectitude as to principle and self-abnegation in action. On every ground of teaching and example, let us pull together; not against Mr. Gladstone, but against his "disruption and plunder" ideas. We must all come to the end of our tether in genius and oratorical power (if we possess one or both). When old age comes out in so many changes of front, and only standing firm in old age obstinacy, and refuses to accept the position, the crisis may be met in few words: *Pro fide, pro rege, pro patriâ, pro lege contendimus.* If this is too serious a view of the crisis, I hope some of your readers will propose better

WATCHWORDS.

June 13th, 1886.

## SELF-DENIAL.

SIR,—The controversy about self-denial is probably only a strife of words. It will be admitted by all, that self-denial, for a worthy purpose, is necessary to any worth or nobility of character, and it will be admitted by almost all, at least among Protestants, that self-denial is utterly worthless, and worse than worthless, if it is practised for its own sake, or as a mere exercise in virtue. This will become still more evident, if, instead of self-denial, we speak of self-sacrifice. Self-sacrifice for a worthy object is martyrdom; self-sacrifice for no object is suicide.

The distinction is most important in education. If young people are not taught self-denial for worthy purposes, they will have no moral strength; but if they are taught self-denial as being something good for its own sake, they will tend to grow up either fanatical ascetics or weak-minded prigs.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, June 12th, 1886.

## Reviews and Notices.

ENGLAND THAT IS TO BE." By the Rev. W. B. Philpot, M.A. (Oxon.), Vicar of South Bersted by Bognor. London: Marshall Brothers, and *Church of England Pulpit* Office. 1886.

THIS is a remarkable volume, full of good sound matter, and written for the times in which we live, and therefore should be studied with great care, being sermons which the author has preached in his own church at South Bersted, and in other places. It is not dedicated to any human friend, or patron, as is generally the case, but to "Our Victorian Democracy:"—and underneath quotes the words used by our Lord, "Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of truth, is come," etc., St. John xvi. 13.

The preface is long and exhaustive, and withal quite out of the beaten track, and contains "The Sketch of a Mode of Preserving a State Christianity without the Violation of Freedom in Religion," in which are some great and important truths which are apt to be neglected in these days.

The first sermon is entitled, "England that is to Be, or Who is not to be Received into the House," and is based on 2 John ix. 10. The "House" here spoken of is interpreted to be the House of Commons, as he says:—

> Therefore to England, if she could only be regarded as one happy family, the apostolic advice would apply. If a man rejects the Son, and therefore the Father, receive him not into your community, much less into your house—your House of Representatives.

And he refers to the fact of Mr. Bradlaugh being returned for Northampton. But it is a mistake to suppose that, because the electors of Northampton returned an avowed atheist to Parliament, that, therefore, infidelity is strong in that town; the atheists, as a body, could *never* have carried the election, as they are in a complete minority; and Bradlaugh's return was due to an "unholy alliance," professedly religious men voted for him, as they expressed it—"not for his religion," but "for his politics."—and the telegram from Mr. Samuel Morley, of course, absolved them from all blame in the matter. Speaking in the same sermon on the power of truth and freedom, he says:—

> Truth will be found to work in this way—mankind will grow free as they grow truthful—free from false ideas that confused them, free from demagogues who mislead them, free from unfair class-interests that hamper them, free from selfishness that cramps them, free from that residuum of the Old Adam type which lingers in their blood. For Christ's principles, as they will come to learn, can alone reach to the roots of moral disease, and save the ratepayers from the ruinous waste of poor-rates and gaols. And when men see that Christ is the cheapest as well as best guide, then they will not allow the right of citizenship to men of other principles, and will not receive stunted and defective natures into their House.

A consummation to be devoutly wished for; and yet we see that the atheist *has* been allowed to go through the form of taking the oath on a book which he has openly condemned. All through this sermon there is a strong protest against the admission of the member for Northampton to a seat in the House of Commons. He quotes Virgil, and the *Antigone* of Sophocles, which, presuming that South Bersted is a country place, and also (presuming) that this sermon was preached there, would seem rather out of place when dealing with such an important subject; he concludes with an earnest appeal, which, if we are to have a general election shortly, may well be sounded as a keynote to all electors, "to send men of the right sort into our National Assembly, men whom no member can charge with disregard of the presence of God and the validity of an oath."

The second sermon, on "The Times of England in the Hands of God," is very appropriate, and in it we have a strong condemnation of the selfish working man, who, "not content with the enviable blessing and high pleasure of truly and fairly getting his own living, and his family's living, by the sweat of his brow, wishes to make laws which shall cancel the commandments of God, as reissued by Christ, and would fain grasp at the living of him to whom the Disposer of humanity has given the liberty of working in his own scope, and doing, within due limits, what he will with his own." And also fears lest the masses, when in power, may not do much for the Church, "except raze her beautiful temples to the ground, with all her material and spiritual designs, leave the nation without a National Church, defile the sacred precincts of our fathers by the abnegation of worship, and vivisect the

spirit from the body politic." This may be true of a few, but we do not believe that it is true of the great mass of the working men of this country, for statistics have proved that the Church is growing, in the large towns especially, and certain it is, that the Church's influence is far stronger to-day than ever it has been before, and the longer time that is given to us before the desire of the Liberationists is brought before Parliament, so much the better for the Church ; and if we only instruct our people in the principles of the Church, we shall ultimately find that there is no desire in the *bonâ fide* working man to "raze her beautiful temples to the ground;" even the chairman of the Congregational Union glories in the beauty of our Church of England, and admires organs, and cathedrals, and services, and white-robed choristers, and the voice of the one matchless liturgy going up one and the same for ten thousand churches.

The sermons on "The Name which is above every Name," and "No Part Dark," are very fine, and deeply spiritual. So also the sermon "On the Death of Babes" is very striking, so much so that we cannot forbear quoting the following :—

> Here is a little bud, a tender nursling of the spring, in the fairest way for flower, fragrance, and fruit, nipped by the world's unkindly weather before a single leaf unfolds itself. Here is a little barque freighted with costly wares for the markets of earth and heaven bound for eternity, launched into life, but wrecked at the harbour mouth. A work nobly simple, yet beautifully complex, with God's fresh breath of life inspiring its every look, and the power of the sweetest nature swaying its every moment ; lo ! it drops from His hand as it might seem, in the very act of His holding it up to show its beauty to the world. It falls to pieces in an hour.

We cannot quite follow the author in his strong condemnation of Rome, as given in his sermon at Arundel, and could have wished that it had not been included in this volume. At the same time, the volume should be carefully studied, as it deserves to be, especially at the present time, when dark clouds are hanging over Church and State. The sermons are very original and striking, the author having fully grasped the truth which he attempts to convey to the minds of his readers and hearers. It will amply repay careful perusal.

"THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE HOLY COMMUNION, RESTATED AS A GUIDE AT THE PRESENT TIME." By the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M.A.; with a preface by the Bishop of Winchester. London : Revington. 1885.

THIS is a most valuable book, and most suitable "for these times," when the Romish doctrine of a local corporal presence is plainly taught by some of our leading Church papers. Mr. Meyrick seems to take much the same ground as did the late Dr. Vogan. His theory is denounced under the term of "Virtualism." But, call it by what name men will, it is the doctrine advocated by our best divines. Cranmer and Ridley learnt it from Bertram, and it has found advocates ever since in Bull, Cosin, Taylor, Andrewes, Jackson, down to our own time.

A leading Church paper tells the world that the Primitive Church was not even patient of Virtualism. This cannot mean that the Primitive Church condemned it ; for it did nothing of the kind. If it is implied that the language of the Fathers is not capable of a virtualist interpretation ; this is not true. All their language can be so explained. No doubt the Fathers used poetical, high-flown expressions as to the presence. But such general language, even in Holy Scripture, often requires to be qualified, Thus our Lord said, "I and my Father are one." and again, "My Father is greater than I." There was an expression used in the schools, *distinguo*. Loose affirmatives are to be qualified by negatives. Thus when it was denied that our Lord had only the appearance of a body, that He could retain two natures was illustrated by reference to the Holy Eucharist. When it was said that one nature must extinguish the other, the answer of the orthodox was that two natures might exist combined, and that it was so as to the Eucharist, in which bread and wine in their natural state, remain combined with the grace which our Lord calls His Body and Blood. The substance of the bread is asserted to remain, as a proof that the natural body of our Lord may be joined to His divinity. Romanists try to make out that *substantia*, οὐσία may merely mean outward appearances. But this would be no answer to those who maintained that our Lord had only the appearance and not the reality, of a man. What was an answer to the Eutychians and Apollinarians, must have been that the bread remains unchanged in its nature after consecration. If Theodoret and Pope Gelasius did not mean, and say, this, they gave up the doctrine of the two natures to their heretical foes. All quotations from the Fathers are capable of a virtualistic interpretation. But Theodoret's and Gelasius's arguments are capable of no other. With this agree our 28th Article and the Black Rubric, which Romanisers would wish to remove from the Prayer-book. If our Lord's Body is present in Heaven alone, it cannot, except by virtue and influence, be present anywhere else. Adoration of a local presence on the altar is therefore excluded. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ*—hence the struggles to get rid of our forms, and to denounce the doctrine advocated by Mr. Meyrick. Mr. Meyrick supports every statement by appeals to antiquity, and our own best divines. We need say no more but that his work has the imprimatur of Bishop Harold Browne of Winchester.

THE Bishop of Derry will preach at Berkeley Chapel, Mayfair, next Sunday morning.

THE weather on Whit-Monday was showery and unpleasant, but Oxford was visited by many large parties, who appeared to enjoy themselves thoroughly. The Oxford House Club from Bethnal Green, who visited the University in a pouring rain last year, appeared again in considerable numbers. One hundred and twenty sat down to lunch in Brasenose Hall, and the Warden of All Souls', Sir William Anson, who presided, welcomed the visitors in a speech, in the course of which he compared the objects of the club with those of a college, and said that he was particularly gratified to welcome the club in Oxford, in order that when Oxford men went to Bethnal Green the members of the club might not feel that they had sprung from the pavement or dropped from the clouds, but might know something of the place they came from, and the way they lived when they were at home. After visiting some of the colleges and the river, the club meet in Balliol hall, to hear an organ recital by Mr. J. Farmer, and were then entertained in small parties at tea in college rooms. A short service in Keble chapel followed, and the visitors returned to London by the last train.

## HER MAJESTY'S JUBILEE YEAR.

ON Sunday next, June 20th, the Queen will enter upon the Fiftieth or Jubilee Year of her beneficent reign. Miss Alice Maud Lever, of Colwyn Bay, makes the very happy and seasonable suggestion that Her Majesty's loyal subjects could not more fitly commence the duties of the day in the home, the Sunday School, and in all places of worship, than by singing "with heart and voice" one or more of the following selected verses, to the tune of the National Anthem :—

God save our gracious Queen,
Long live our noble Queen,
God save the Queen !
Send her victorious,
Happy and glorious,
Long to reign over us,
God save the Queen !

Through every changing scene,
O Lord, preserve our Queen ;
Long may she reign !
Her heart inspire and move
With wisdom from above,
And in a nation's love
Her throne maintain.

Crowned by a nation's love,
Guarded by Heaven above,
Long live the Queen !
Loud may each voice proclaim,
Wide as Britannia's fame,
Long live Victoria's name,
God save the Queen.

LAST week the Bishop of Manchester made his first appearance at Blackburn and consecrated a church dedicated to St. Barnabas in one of the poorest parts of the town. The Rev. P. E. Thomas, curate of St. Paul's, has been selected to be vicar.

ON Whitsunday the Bishop of London preached at St. Saviour's, Oxford Street, the Church of the Deaf and Dumb. The service was conducted orally, and also in the finger and sign language, the interpreter easily keeping pace with the most rapid utterances of the reader or preacher.

THE Chichester Diocesan Conference will meet at the cathedral city on October 26th and 27th, and the subjects chosen for discussion are—(1) The Archbishop of Canterbury's Bill on Patronage, (2) the Bishop of Peterborough's Parish Churches Bill, (3) the three measures relating to extraordinary tithe introduced into the House of Commons during the present session, and (4) the Church of England Purity Society.

THE Rev. W. C. Reid, rector of Coppenhall Crewe, has just issued an address to his parishioners, in which he says :—"The rector has much pleasure in announcing that funerals may shortly be conducted with full Catholic ceremonies. There will be a handsome violet pall for adult communicants ; a white pall and suitable bier for the funerals of children. There will also be six funeral lights flanking the coffin on either side. A burial guild is in contemplation, with the object of securing increased reverence in the treatment of the dead, and especially of providing choral burial for deceased members of the congregation, being communicants, and their children. The crucifix will be used on these occasions, with acolytes and surpliced choir. Where thought desirable incense will be employed, so beautifully symbolical of the mutual intercession by which living and departed are bound together." The rector goes on to suggest that in laying out the dead the hands should always be crossed upon the breast, and that a cross or crucifix should mark the coffin.

THE Rev. Francis John Jayne, Principal and Professor of Theology and Greek at St. David's College, Lampeter, South Wales, has accepted the vicarage of Leeds in succession to Dean Gott. Mr. Jayne, who was born on the 1st of January, 1845, was educated at Rugby, and in 1864 went up to Oxford as a scholar of Wadham College, where he was at once recognised as an undergraduate likely to add to the fame of his college. This promise was borne out when in Easter Term, 1865, Mr. Jayne was one of an exceptionally brilliant body of men who took a First Class in Classical Moderations. Two years later—namely, in Trinity Term, 1867, he was one of the seven undergraduates who secured a First Class in the Honour School of *Literae Humaniores*, and the only one of the seven who, subsequently, secured a fellowship. He also shared with Sir Walter Phillimore the further honour of a First Class in the then combined school of Law and Modern History. Having taken his degree, Mr. Jayne stood the following year for a fellowship at Jesus College, to which he was elected. In 1870 he received both deacon's and priest's orders from the Bishop of Oxford, and began parochial work as assistant-curate in the parish of St. Clement's, Oxford. The same year saw Mr. Jayne a successful candidate for the Senior Hall-Houghton Greek Testament Prize, recently founded and then offered for the second time. In 1871 his parochial work was resigned for that of a lectureship at his own college and a tutorship at Keble ; but his success in the pulpit was recognised by his selection as Whitehall preacher from 1875 to 1877. The Principalship of St. David's College, Lampeter, falling vacant in 1879, Mr. Jayne was chosen successor to the Very Rev. Ll. Llewellin, who had combined the two offices of Dean of St. David's and Principal of the college. At the same time Mr. Jayne became sinecure rector of Lampeter, a benefice in the gift of the college, to which an income of £240 per annum is attached. In 1884 Mr. Jayne was chosen by his University as one of the select preachers for the year 1884-5. St. David's being a college qualified by charter to confer degrees, Mr. Jayne has been brought into intimate contact with Welsh students preparing for secular pursuits in addition to those about to enter the ministry. St. David's College was founded by Bishop Burgess in the year 1822, with the especial view of providing an educated class of ministers for the Church in Wales. It is at the present time an affiliated college of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. It has had among its vice-principals several distinguished Churchmen, such as the present Bishop of Winchester, the Dean of Peterborough, the late Bishop of Llandaff, and Dr. Rowland Williams. During Mr. Jayne's principalship science teaching has been developed, and a school has been established in connection with the college. Mr. Jayne has also held a seat on the council of the University College at Cardiff. "The new vicar (says the *Yorkshire Post*) is known among his clerical and academic brethren as 'one of the best unpromoted men in the Church'—that is to say, that there are in the establishment few clergymen of his attainments who have not obtained high preferment. The Leeds people will find in Mr, Jayne a man of vigorous and solid character, clear-headed, possessing exceptional

powers of work, of good address, with a sympathetic and genial temperament, and a man of tact. Of moderate High Church views, with liberal tendencies, Mr. Jayne is said to be a preacher of considerable power. As Oxford preacher at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, he generally preached extempore, and his sermon in St. Paul's, in May, 1883, at the consecration of three bishops, was described by Dr. Vaughan as 'a model of force and pathos.' His style is characterised by force, directness, and grace. His success as an organiser, administrator, and man of business is attested by the fact that under his headship St. David's College has risen enormously, and has now become one of the most efficient academic institutions in the kingdom."

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arnold, Rev. George M. Brock, M.A., Chaplain to the Workhouses and Infirmary, St. Giles's, Camberwell.
Cardew, Rev. J. H., Chaplain of Cheltenham Workhouse; Rector of Buckland, Gloucestershire.
Carolin, Rev. John Robert S., Curate; Vicar of St Matthew's, Denmark-hill.
Clarke, Rev. E. A. T., M.A., Assistant-Master of the High School, Nottingham, and late Curate of Basford; Head Master of the Endowed School, Longton, Staffs.
Davis, Rev. Thomas. M.A., Vicar of St. John's Harborne.
Edwards, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rector of Burslem.
Hayes, Rev. James Thomas, M.A., Rector of Swineshead, Kimbolton; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hinckley.
Hensley, Rev. H. G., Curate of St. James's, Taunton.
Hill, Rev. P. Oakley, Vicar of Upton, Norfolk.
Hutchinson, Rev. Samuel, Vicar of Christ Church, Penge.
Jayne, Rev. Francis John, M.A., Principal and Professor of Theology and Greek at St. David's College, Lampeter, South Wales; Vicar of Leeds.
Lakeman, Rev. George, M.A., Incumbent of St. Mark's, St. Helens.
Miller, Rev. Joseph, B.D., Rector of Bolus Magna, Wellington, Salop.
Morrison, Rev. Riddell, Chaplain to the Forces 4th Class; Chaplain to the Forces 3rd Class.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allen, Rev. William, M.A., Cantab., son of the late W. Allen, Esq., of the Acton Grammar-school, Cheshire, on the 10th inst., at the Laurels, Silverdale, Sydenham, aged 39.
Blyth, Rev. William, M.A., Hon. Canon of Norwich. forty years Rector of Fincham, and thirty-seven years Rural Dean, on the 10th inst., at Fincham Rectory, Norfolk, aged 76.
Edwards, Rev. Joseph, many years Rector of Croft and Yarpole, Rural Dean and Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral, on the 7th inst., at Southsea, aged 74.
Emra, Rev. John, late Vicar of Biddestone, on the 9th inst., at Box, aged 79.
Fielder, Rev. Richard Ramsay, M.A., of Jesus College, Cambridge, on the 6th inst., at Folkestone, aged 63.
Fisk, Rev. John Hammond, on the 4th inst., at East-cliff House, Hastings, aged 93.
Goldie, Rev. George, M.A., Rector of Farmington, on the 10th inst., at 35 Tedworth-square, Chelsea, aged 57.
Holberton, Rev. Robert, M.A., formerly Archdeacon of St. John's, Antigua, West Indies, and for twenty-five years Vicar of St. Peter's Norbiton, Surrey, on the 14th inst., at Devon Lodge, Kew, aged 86.
Lohr, Rev. Charles William Hankes, lately Curate of St. Breage, on the 8th inst., at Alburgh Rectory, Harleston, aged 28.
Monnington. Rev. George, for thirty-six years Vicar of Bitteswell, on the 14th inst., at 9 Morland-road, Croydon, aged 83.
Moor. Rev. Edward James, Rector of the parish and Hon. Canon of Norwich, on the 10th inst., at Great Bealings Rectory, Woodbridge, aged 86.
Potter, Rev. Richard, M.A., formerly Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, Emeritus Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy, University College, London, on the 6th inst., at Cambridge, aged 87.
Power, Rev. John Arthur, M.A. and L.M. Cantab., L.R.C.P. London, late Senior Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, on the 9th inst., at 65, Ashburnham-road Bedford, of syncope, aged 76.
Thompson, Rev. John, thirty-six years Vicar of Easby, on the 7th inst., at Easby, Richmond, Yorkshire, aged 78.


## FACTS FOR HEALTH SEEKERS.

PRESENTLY people will be hurrying away to the mountains and the seaside, their stock of nerve force being exhausted through overwork. In seeking a change of air they not only acted under medical advice, but they obeyed a natural instinct. Many of us, especially those who dwell in towns, find the external conditions depressing, because the wear and tear and mental strain are too great, the nervous system flags, and the healthy action of the organism generally is interfered with. The power for resistance, or, what may be termed *self-assistance*, is rendered inert; consequently health fluctuates or declines, and counterbalancing conditions are imperatively called for. That the action of Odo-Magnetism is to supply the conditions most favourable to recuperation is proved by what it has done, and by the facts and truths stated in the few following sentences :—

Every living animal experiences sensations produced by the positive and negative state of the atmosphere, and every scientist knows the sensation felt in the nervous system from certain forms of electricity. The vigorous, braced-up condition of the nerves as the effect of mountain air or sea-breezes conveys some idea of the invigoration realised by the proximity of Odo-Magnetic influence. Nature and art now combine to render this subtle force constantly in action or perpetual operation. A power for good as natural as the air we breathe is superadded for the invalid's advantage, surrounding him, as it were, by a vitalising atmosphere.

The essential characteristics of *Odo-Magnetic influence* are its penetrating and permeating qualities, and the unabated regularity in its lines of force, which are equally distributed and well balanced in their operation so as to induce a uniform flow of health in the living organism even amidst surrounding disturbances.

Our principle of application is to infuse this unseen but energising force in such a manner as to affect the whole organism for good. Our attention is especially directed to the mental disturbance or nervous affection which is too often the original cause of physical ailments. By this means we supply the overworked man with the like physieal stimulus to that which he gets from the mountain air and sea breezes, and often more effectually.

Mr. J. YOUNG, 207, High Street, Camden Town, N.W.

FEBRUARY 10, 1886.—"I am now in a position to state definitely and candidly that, under the blessing of God, I owe the good health I now have to the use of the Odo-Magnetic Nerve Invigorator you prescribed for me more than twelve months ago. Before coming to you I was under medical treatment for a long time without benefit; in fact, I rather grew worse, so much so, that I felt quite unfit for business, and contemplated giving up my situation and going home. My business necessitates much standing and long hours, so that at the close of the day I felt unable to walk upstairs to my bedroom, I was so utterly worn out. Being advised by a friend to consult you, I did so, after which my previous good health returned. I have been wonderfully free from colds all through this winter, and have had no occasion to take medicine of any kind since wearing the Apparel. I shall always have pleasure in recommending your Treatment to my friends and acquaintances as opportunity presents itself."

It will be regarded as a pleasure by Mr. B. C. Garratt to do anything to extend the knowledge of this subject, and to afford any desired information. His advice may be had gratuitously, by personal application or by letter, and those whose sufferings have become chronic through the failure of ordinary remedies are, if possible, more especially welcome to his attention. A thoughtfully candid opinion may always be anticipated, with the fullest consideration of all necessities and varying features of the case submitted. B. COPSON GARRETT, 16, Finsbury Square, London, E.C.

# The Church of England Pulpit.

## THE VICTORY THAT OVERCOMETH THE WORLD.

By the Rev. Canon ROBERTS, M.A., Vicar of Spratton, Northampton.

Sermon Preached in St. Lawrence's Church, Northampton, for Northampton Church Extension Fund (Diocesan Finance Sunday).

"This is the victory that overcometh the world."—1 St. John, v. 4.

HOW familiar a phrase is "The battle of life!" Yet it has many meanings, according to the lips that utter it. It means in all cases the encountering of opposition; the struggle for objects difficult to obtain: the resistance to injustice and the endurance of trial. But if men could look into their thoughts they would find that they differ greatly as to the opponents to be mastered and to the objects to be attained. With the vast numerical majority of mankind it means the struggle for existence: the securing a maintenance, a position, a place of sufficiency or of superiority in life. And this of course is well enough: these in their degree are very worthy objects, and such as no sensible man can afford to neglect.

Or, again, with others,—or, indeed, with the same persons viewed from a different side,—the battle of life is the contest with *themselves:* the life-long contest with natural faults of temper and of disposition. There are those to whom it is the work of a whole life to attain the mastery over themselves, their quick and over-hasty temper;—their too ready and unguarded tongue;—their jealous and so suspicious disposition, to subdue the violence of their passion, or the excesses of their ambition, avarice, or pride. Honourable men and women are they, and greatly deserving our respect and sympathy, who are thus conscientiously fighting the good fight with their own selves, and striving to rise superior to their own weakness, conquerors of their faults. There are others who look upon the world external to themselves: upon its sins, its miseries, its sorrows: who feel unhappy at the sight, and very anxious to do their part in the great war against wrong and the wretchedness which follows upon wrong. Whilst conscious of evil within them, and of the warfare which has ever to be carried on in their own hearts, they are not the less deeply moved by the never-ending struggle which is going on around. Here, too, they would overcome the world, and assure the victory to right.



Now of the first of the three combatants of whom I have spoken I do not intend to say more at present. The struggle for a livelihood is not in the Christian sense a doing battle with the world, though doubtless the struggle may and ought to be carried on in the faith and in the spirit of a Christian. Rather at present I propose to speak of that direct warfare with sin, that resistance to the world, the flesh, and the devil, which every soldier of Christ is pledged to carry on. Within, in his own heart, and without, in the world around, he sees the contest raging, in which he must of necessity take part on one side or the other, and to such a one there can surely be no question that touches him more closely than this—"What is the victory which overcometh the world?"

The Apostle St. John, who himself had overcome the world, both in his own heart and in the society around him, supplies the answer—the power that alone can conquer is our faith.

And that, indeed, this must be so will be clear from a moment's consideration.

But for that faith which presents to us the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen, the world within and the world without, are positively the whole of things—there is nothing left to carry on the war. If a man have not faith in God and in His word, then his inclination is naturally and necessarily the strongest thing within him. The world, the flesh, and the devil are in exclusive alliance with his own will, there is in his hand no "sword of the Spirit," there is for his protection no "complete armour of God." And if there be no faith of God in Christ, the world at large is but one scene of a fierce and cruel struggle for things temporal: one battle-ground of passion and greed and rivalry for place or for power, or for pleasure, or for subsistence. The highest law which the world can know apart from faith in God is the law of political economy, *i.e.*, the law of the pursuit and accumulation of wealth, with all its hard and crushing consequences—the grinding of the poor, the oppression of the weak, the reign supreme and without mitigation of mere "self." I rank the cold, hard law of political economy as the *highest law* of this world; but there are other lower and more cruel laws, as of lust and violence, and robbery and wrong. It should be carefully noted and remembered, that government apart from religious principles means *government by force;* and government by force means government by the violent and unscrupulous when force shall have passed into their hands, government by dynamite and by the dagger. I know of no law of justice apart from the law of God. Justice to me means that I have my rights: and if there be no *divine* law of justice, and I have brute power at my command, then my will is the sole measure of my rights. I say it in all seriousness, and I leave it to your careful reflection whether it be not true, that government by dynamite is the natural and legitimate result of

government by atheism, and that in the meantime, government by spoliation is—as you may see in history past and present—the intermediate stage. However, I do not wish to dwell upon this. I state it now, not as the mere point of an epigram, but as severe philosophical truth, to which I challenge contradiction. But let us see how the whole picture changes as there shines down upon human society the light of divine faith—the faith, *i.e.*, in God's justice, goodness, and truth: the faith in His ever-present Providence, and in His final judgment at the last.

And, first, let us consider the struggle as it exists in a man's own heart: his personal conflict with sin and wrong.

Possessed of this faith he lives in the light of God—that light which results at once in the love and in the fear of Him. This is the divine, the exquisite paradox (so to speak) of the Gospel of Christ, that it blends thus the fear and the love of God: a filial fear, a childlike love, uniting in the fruit of holiness. Oh, who can tell the blessedness of a life in the fear and love of God? and who will tell the wretchedness of a life without that love and fear? Who that lives it will consent to disclose it, and to declare its poverty, its misery? But our faith brings more than this, more even than the knowledge of God's holiness which causes us to fear Him, and of His love, which enables us to love Him. It brings us into the armoury of heaven, and equips us for the fight. It girds the loins about with truth, and puts upon us the breastplate of righteousness, and on our feet it binds the sandals of the Gospel of Peace. Above all, it holds the great shield of faith, and crowns us with the helmet of salvation and arms us with the sword of the Spirit, teaching us to pray always, with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and to watch with all perseverance.

Vain is the warfare with evil, alone and in our own strength; but no longer vain when we fight in His name and under His banner who hath said to each combatant, "My grace is sufficient for thee."

Then, as to the battle in the world around—the battle with the powers of sin and unbelief and all their hellish crew.

Alas! to stand upon some commanding hill and gaze upon some great city, teeming with thousands reeking with intoxication, profligacy and vice—what should a man do but that which the Lord Jesus did as He looked upon Jerusalem—look and weep? O God, O God, what shall heal these sorrows, what shall stem the overwhelming tide of sin and suffering, what shall overcome this world of ungodliness? Shall we turn to those influences which the world itself suggests; shall wealth suffice, good times, prosperity? Full well we know *they only aggravate it.* With fulness of trade and money come in luxury and lust like a flood. Shall knowledge, education, culture as it is called, apart from faith? Only look beneath the surface of the highest civilisation and is it not a tenfold mass of misery that is hidden there? Athens and Rome have left their records; the walls of Pompeii were painted for a perpetual memorial of a vicious civilisation. Let the Haymarket and Regent Street speak for London. Education sharpens the faculties for action—true, but it sharpens and intensifies the faculties for suffering. Mark this, my friends, *suicide is the last resource of educated despair.* Or shall it be human law? Why, human law can touch but the *outside* of human life—the cancer is *within.* Well, then, let us turn once more to the Apostle, and ask of him the solution of our difficulty. "This is the victory which overcometh the world, even our faith." The faith in the eternal and unseen God, the maker, the judge, the ruler of all. The faith in the blessed Gospel of His Son, in whom He is faithful and just to forgive us all our sin, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. The faith in His Holy Spirit, who can awaken the dead in trespasses, arouse the conscience, quicken the soul to love, to life, to obedience.

Courage, my friends. What said St. Paul as he contemplated his journey to the great city of Rome, the very throne of mammon. "I am not ashamed," he said, "of the Gospel, for it is *the power of God*," and the power of God cannot fail.

This, then, my brethren, is the work before us. To plant the Gospel of the living God and to extend its influence in that great town which is our neighbour. To plant and to sustain in its midst the power of God unto salvation, lest, indeed, that great town become as a pit of destruction to swallow up our sons and our daughters as we send them there to fight the battle of their lives. Let us do what in us lies to plant there and to sustain in efficiency the ministry of the Divine Word and sacraments, and the temples of a true and spiritual worship. So shall we prevail in the strength of that Gospel which is the power of God. So shall we be more than conquerors in that victory which overcometh the world—even our faith.

Yet, after all, whilst we thus create and extend the agency by which this battle is to be fought and this victory to be won amongst our brethren, our first and greatest care must be that by God's grace this same contest be carried on successfully within; that whilst, as is our duty, we provide the sacred armoury for others, we too put on the whole armour of God, and, having done all, may stand, stand triumphant in the might of a living faith over the powers of evil within.

---

CANON VENABLES has announced his determination to resign the vicarage of Great Yarmouth.

## NATIONAL DISRUPTION.

By the Rev. Sir EMILIUS BAYLEY, Bart., B.D., Vicar of St. John's, Paddington.

Sermon Preached in St. John's Church, on the Anniversary of the Queen's Accession, June 20th, 1886.

"So the people answered the king, saying, What portion have we in David? neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: to your tents, O Israel: now see to thine own house, David. So Israel departed unto their tents."—1 Kings xii. 16.

THESE words describe the disruption of the Jewish nation, after an unbroken political existence of more than 500 years. National disruption is an idea with which unhappily we have been made familiar: and I propose to inquire what light is thrown upon it in the Word of God. These old Jewish records do not belong exclusively to the buried past: the clothing of outward circumstance has indeed changed, but the animating spirit changes not: the eternal laws by which God governed the old world are those by which He governs us, and the same moral forces ever control the rise and fall of the nations of the earth. We will examine, then, this old story of national disruption: we will note the causes which led to it, and the results by which it was followed: we will ask cautiously what bearing it has upon events of our own time, and what guidance it offers us in what appears to many to be a very grave and solemn crisis of our national life. These things surely "were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come." (1 Cor. x. 11.)

I. First, then, The Fact of the disruption.

It is historically true that shortly after the death of Solomon, the Jewish nation, which had hitherto been one, became two; divided into two unequal parts: and that the breach thus made was never healed. The virtual founder of the Jewish monarchy was David, but the greatness of the kingdom culminated under the rule of his son: the glory of Solomon still appeals powerfully to the imagination of the civilised world. We might have thought that an empire created by the military talent of David, and cemented by the wisdom of Solomon, was destined to stand. Had any political prophet stood forth during the early years of Solomon's reign, and announced that in less than a generation his kingdom would fall to pieces, broken up, not by aggression from without, but by antagonistic forces from within, his words would have sounded like idle tales: the political forecast would rather have been one of union, not separation; of growing power and influence, not of disruption and decay. But man untaught of God is a bad prophet: there are forces often in operation which he cannot or will not recognise, and the mine is not seldom sprung when and where he least expects it. Thus the nation which rested in majestic and secure repose during the peaceful reign of Solomon, woke up at his death to find itself torn by contending factions, its unity shattered, its magnificence for ever gone. Such is the fact. We will now ask whether the event thus recorded admits of explanation, whether any reasons can be discovered why this great and united empire was thus suddenly and hopelessly rent in twain.

II. The Causes.

Of this we may, I think, be certain, that no great changes ever take place in the life of a nation without adequate cause. The change may be wise or unwise, beneficial or the reverse; but there are always causes in operation which produce it: and in great national convulsions attention is commonly fixed upon the individual or individuals who control them. What is now known as the one-man power undoubtedly exists: it is likely to become an increasing power as the democratic principle extends. But the power of the individual could never prevail, except as the embodiment of a spirit already in existence. No one-man power has probably ever exceeded that of the first Napoleon, certainly not in modern times. Thiers closes his History of the Empire with these suggestive words: "The life of this great man, so instructive for soldiers, rulers and politicians, contains a lesson also for citizens. It teaches them that they ought never to abandon their country to the power of one man, no matter who he may be, no matter under what circumstances! This is the cry that springs from my heart, as I conclude this long history of our triumphs and of our reverses, and which I hope will penetrate the heart of every Frenchman, and persuade him never to sacrifice his liberty, by abusing it." Weighty and impressive words: may their teaching not be altogether lost to us! But still we affirm of this one-man power, that Napoleon, great as he was, was only great, in his world-controlling influence, as the embodiment of the revolutionary spirit: in him the time and the man met together: not the time without the man, or the man without the time, but the two combined: and thus was produced the prodigy which Modern Europe knew but too well. In the same way, upon a less prominent, but not less instructive, platform the human author of Jewish disruption, Jeroboam the son of Nebat, would have been powerless as a revolutionary agent if he had not had behind him certain pre-existing forces of which he was the representative, and by means of which he achieved his end. It is not so much therefore to the one-man power, great as it has been in the past, and great as it may yet be again, that we must look for the true causes of revolution: these causes are not found in the individual, but in the spirit which he represents, in that subtle movement of opinion which makes, and as often unmakes, the idol which it worships.

Passing by, then, the prime agent in Jewish dis-

ruption, Jeroboam the son of Nebat, and viewing him simply as a bold, energetic, strong-willed, ambitious man, who did the work which offered itself, we will ask what were some of the disuniting causes already in operation, when he came upon the scene.

*Tribal Jealousy* on the part of the great northern tribe of Ephraim was undoubtedly one provoking cause of the disruption. The jealousy of Ephraim had been the growth of centuries. To the house of Joseph, with its adjacent tribes of Benjamin and Manasseh, had belonged, down to the time of David, all the chief rulers of Israel: and it was natural that with such a noble ancestry Ephraim should have resented any rival supremacy. We have an instance of this in the restoration of David after the rebellion of Absolom. The men of Judah claimed to escort the King back: "And, behold, all the men of Israel came to the king and said unto the king, Why have our brethren the men of Judah stolen thee away, and have brought the king and his household over Jordan?" The men of Judah justified their action by their near kinship to David. "And the men of Israel answered the men of Judah, and said, We have ten parts in the king, and we have also more right in David than ye: why, then, did ye despise us, that our advice should not be first had in bringing back our king? And the words of the men of Judah were fiercer than the words of the men of Israel" (2 Sam. xix. 41, 43). Here was the germ of a truly typical quarrel: north and south, as so often since, ranged against each other: jealous and angry feelings long existing, and needing but little provocation to burst into a flame.

*Unredressed Grievances.*—On the accession of Rehoboam a deputation from the northern tribes came to the king with a statement of their wrongs: "Thy father made our yoke grievous: now, therefore, make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his heavy yoke which he put upon us, lighter, and we will serve thee" (1 Kings xii. 4). The yoke of which they complained was probably the double yoke of forced labour and oppressive taxation: but, whatever the grievance was, it certainly existed, and they had justice on their side in approaching the throne with a petition for redress.

Thus far the northern tribes were clearly within their rights: they made no demand for independent government, much less for separation: they enforced their claim by no threat of lawless rebellion, by no hint of having recourse to force. Their grievances were real ones: they pleaded calmly for relief, and if relief were granted they would be content.

*Political Incapacity.*—The existence of a long-standing jealousy, and the pressure of heavy wrongs, would probably not have sufficed to bring about disruption, apart from the incapacity, the infatuation we may call it, of the ruler. It needed but a very moderate share of political common sense, and the danger would pass away. The petition of right was not indeed at once rejected. The king asks for time to consider it. So far well. Consultation and deliberation follow. On the one side is the ripe experience of age, the counsel of politicians schooled in the wisdom of Solomon, the judgment of statesmen who might have recalled to Rehoboam his father's words, "Thine own friend, and thy father's friend, forsake not." On the other is the prejudice of a class, of an impetuous, self-willed, arrogant class, ready enough to flatter the monarch and to pander to his lust of power, but indifferent to the people's wrongs, and blind to the possible consequences of ill-judged advice. The older statesmen advise concession, or at least that the wrongs should be inquired into and redressed: the younger courtiers would treat the demand as an insult, and fling it back with words of bitterness and scorn. The sequel is well known. The petition is rejected: the die is cast: and disruption follows: and the unity of the nation's life is for ever shattered and gone. "So when all Israel saw that the king hearkened not unto them, the people answered the king saying, What portion have we in David? neither have we inheritance in the house of Jesse: to your tents, O Israel: now see to thine own house, David. So Israel departed unto their tents."

Thus far we have traced the human element in the causes which led to the disruption of the Jewish nation. The rending of the kingdom was not a sudden, an isolated event: it came not without warning: and it contained within it a prophecy which has been often fulfilled since. But we have not exhausted the subject: and we should miss what appears to be the most pregnant lesson of the Jewish disruption, if we did not trace it up to its prime originating cause. The disruption was not brought about only, or even chiefly, by tribal jealousy, or by unredressed grievances, or by political incapacity: these were certainly provoking causes: but they were not the essential cause. That is to be found elsewhere.

*The Righteous Judgment of God.*—God deals with nations, as nations, in this world. The nation has no national life except in this world: it exists not as a nation in a future state. With the individual it is different: he may be dealt with judicially either here or hereafter. Not so the nation. National sin involves therefore national punishment, and the judgments of God are designed to lead to national repentance.

Now the disruption of the Jewish nation is expressly traced up to the sin of Solomon and his people. The dark record of Solomon's degeneracy is immediately followed by the announcement of coming judgment: and the judgment is defined to be national disruption. "Wherefore the Lord said unto Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will

surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant" (1 Kings xi. 11). The passions or the incompetence of man might be employed to bring about the result: but viewed in its essence it was a judgment, the judicial action of the moral government of God, the national punishment of national sin.

We need not dwell upon the moral evils which abounded, or inquire in what proportion the blame was distributed between the monarch and his people. Evil, deep-seated evil, undoubtedly existed: idolatry, sensuality, covetousness, extravagance, oppression, largely prevailed: and we may be sure that judgment did not fall, until the cup of national iniquity was full. It was the application of well-known principles: "Be sure your sin will find you out." They "that have sown the wind shall reap the whirlwind."

III. The Results.

The subsequent history of the two nations furnishes a dark comment upon the disruption. Idolatry more or less prevailed in both: national corruption increased: heavy judgment fell in vain upon an apostate people: until unforsaken sin issued in their ruin. To the northern nation, the direct author of the disruption, the loss was the greatest. Separated from the Sanctuary of God by the policy of its rulers, and taught to worship in direct violation of the divine command, its fall was the more rapid, its apostacy the more complete. For the northern tribes disruption carried with it its own punishment: if they gained the independence of self-will, they lost the favour of God; and, when their cup was full, were swept away by a calamity as overwhelming as it was deserved. There is no more striking illustration of the downward progress of national sin, and of the certainty with which the wheels of divine judgment do their strange work, than that supplied by the gloomy record of Israel's apostacy and final ruin.

Thus far I have endeavoured to trace briefly the fact of Jewish disruption, the causes which led to it, and some of the consequences which it entailed. What are some of the inferences, some of the lessons, which this survey of the history suggests?

*National Disruption a Divine Judgment.*—There may be circumstances under which two portions of a nation may by mutual consent agree to a division, and create, each for itself, a separate national existence. But that question does not often arise: in the case before us the disruption was a forcible one: and is treated in Scripture as a judgment upon sin. The thing itself therefore was an evil: it destroyed at one stroke the unity of the nation: it weakened its powers for defence: it intensified and confirmed the jealousies and rivalries already in existence: it proved the fruitful source of strife between the two people, and undoubtedly hastened on their national overthrow.

2. *Jealousy, Wrong, Misgovernment no sufficient excuse for Disruption:* however much they may account for and explain it. The Jewish disruption was permitted by God: nay, it was directly ordained by Him: but no sanction was thereby given to those evil passions and impolitic measures by means of which it was brought about.

3. *The Danger of Disruption always imminent wherever National Sin prevails.*—Disruption is not the form of chastisement which the Divine Ruler always employs: there are other means of punishment available: but disruption is a judgment which God has made use of in the past, and which he may at any time make use of in the future.

4. *As National Disruption is the consequence of National Sin, National Repentance is the true Safeguard against National Disruption.*—The threat of coming judgment is a call to repentance: and repentance has often proved the means of averting the judgment. "And God saw their works, that they returned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil that he had said that he would do unto them; and he did it not." (Jon. iii. 10. See also Jer. xviii. 7, 8.)

Jewish disruption then a divine judgment upon sin: Jewish disruption explained and accounted for, but not excused, by the jealousies, the unredressed grievances, the political errors which produced it: Jewish disruption a type and prophecy of possible national disruption, wherever national sin abounds: Jewish disruption capable of being averted, in common with all similar disruption, by national repentance: these I think are some of the lessons taught by this crisis in Jewish history.

It now remains to us to inquire in what relation Jewish disruption stands to events of our own time: and what clue, if any, it affords to the solution of difficulties in which as a nation we are involved.

*The Question before us.*—Whatever false issues may be raised, we undoubtedly stand face to face at this moment with the question of National Disruption. The Government of the day has sought to solve the difficulties of the Irish rule by bringing forward a measure which, in the judgment of a large majority of the most eminent of our politicians, *tends to the disruption of the empire.* The Government measure has been described as a Separation Bill: and this definition has been sneered at as "the merest slang of vulgar tongues." That is not the language of courtesy: it certainly is not argument: besides the question is not of the vulgarity of the definition, but of its truth: and it is beyond dispute that in the opinion of a very large proportion of the skilled political intelligence of the day, the Government Bill, if passed, must tend to produce separation between the two countries. I do not say that such is the opinion of its authors: but there are many, at least as able, as disinterested, as patriotic as they are, who think

differently, and have shown the courage of their opinions by rejecting the Bill on that ground in the House of Commons.

We need not however rest on the opinions of others. Every man can judge for himself, whether the establishment of a separate Irish Parliament and an independent Irish Executive, with absolute control over legislation and the administration of law throughout Ireland, whilst bound at the same time to pay several millions a year to the British Treasury, would not prove the source of constant irritation and agitation, until the scarcely veiled demands of the Separatist party had been completely satisfied.

The question therefore before us is narrowed to a simple issue: it is the question of the passage or rejection of a measure, which carries within it at least the germ of national disruption. If the measure passes, which it will do if the country supports the policy of the Government, we are brought, in the judgment of our wisest and most trusted statesmen, within measurable distance of that great calamity. The conviction thus formed is very strongly held: it has led many to sacrifice the interests of party, to sever the ties of political friendship, to forfeit, it may be, the aims of legitimate ambition, rather than run the risk of acting as the pioneers of disruption: the appeal is now made to the country: to the country they are content to go.

We stand then in the position of the Jewish nation at the time of the accession of Rehoboam: we have before us the possibility, the threat of national disruption: the danger exists: is there no way of escape open to us?

*The Religious Aspect of the Question.*—This question has been discussed hitherto exclusively from the political side: in Parliament and out of Parliament it has been argued from considerations drawn only from secular politics. I do not quarrel with this. You cannot separate a Christian's religious life from his life as a citizen: St. Paul spoke of himself as "a citizen of no mean city;" and, when occasion called, he could and did claim the privileges of Roman citizenship. Still I would maintain that, if as Christians we acknowledge the moral Government of God, if we believe Him to be in very truth the "King of nations," then must we hold that there is a Divine as well as a human side in public affairs; and it behoves us to study the religious aspect of every great national crisis.

You will recall the conclusions we arrived at as to the causes which led to the disruption of the Jewish nation: and that we found good reason for believing that, whilst certain subordidate influences, such as tribal jealousy, unredressed wrongs, political incapacity, certainly helped to bring about the catastrophe, the prime and essential cause is to be found in the sin of the ruler and his people. The rending of the kingdom was a Divine judgment: national sin was the true cause of national disruption.

Now let us assume that rivalries and jealousies between different sections of the inhabitants of these islands have long existed: that grievances have remained unredressed: and that Government has not always been wise, tolerant, and just, in its action: has there not been behind all this, yea, is there not still, a vast amount of moral corruption which is hateful in the sight of God, and which may justly bring down His judgments upon our land. We, who profess to be an imperial race, whose empire at this moment is by far the largest which the world has ever known, are met by local difficulties which tax the wisdom of the wisest, and have to acknowledge that whilst abroad our rule is undisturbed, at home there is "distress of nations with perplexity."

Brethren! Is there not a cause? May not God be saying to us, as He said to Israel: "What could have been done more to My vineyard, that I have not done in it? wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?" This is no time for mutual recrimination. If on the one side there has been lawlessness, cruelty, bloodshed: on the other, drunkenness, avarice, the "lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the vain-glory of life" have largely prevailed: "pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness:" and may not God be chastising us for our sins? "Shall I not visit for these things? saith the Lord: and shall not My soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" This threat of national disruption may be as a still small voice calling us to repentance: it certainly warns us of danger: may the warning not be in vain. The Christian, at all events, will feel that our political outlook would be more hopeful, if as a nation we recognised the moral gravity of the crisis, and resolved in all sincerity to "break off our sins by righteousness, and our iniquities by showing mercy to the poor."

*The Political Aspect of the Question.*—A difficult and anxious subject, but one from which, as it has been forced upon us, we cannot turn aside. I do not of course forget that difference of opinion exists not only upon the abstract question of the concession of some form of Home Rule to Ireland; but also upon the particular measure proposed and adhered to by the Government. It is with this latter that we have to deal: and whilst conceding to others the fullest right to exercise their own judgment upon it, we claim a like liberty for ourselves.

The question for solution is a simple one. In what way may we best hope to secure the prosperity of the British Empire, and of Ireland, as an integral portion of that Empire? Are the proposals now before the country likely to promote that end? We who are electors are called upon to vote upon this question: Aye or No.

If in our consciences we believe that the policy of the Government will tend to "the consolidation

of the unity of the Empire," and prove "a great addition to its strength :" that it will secure "the stoppage of a heavy, constant, and demoralising waste of public treasure :" and that it will bring about "the abatement and greater extinction of ignoble feuds in Ireland, and that development of her resources which experience shows to be the natural consequence of free and orderly government :" then shall we give our vote in favour of that policy. But if in our consciences we believe in none of these things : if on the contrary we are persuaded that such policy tends to shatter the unity of the Empire, to sap its vitality, and to destroy its strength : that so far from stopping the waste of public treasure, it calls upon the tax-payers of Great Britain to pay at least fifty millions as the price of national dismemberment : and that, instead of extinguishing feuds and developing resources, its bare announcement has stirred up the passions of contending factions in Ireland to the verge of civil war ; has paralysed trade, has put a stop to enterprise, and is daily driving away capital as from a doomed land : then surely, to whatever party we belong, we shall offer to that policy our most strenuous opposition.

We must beware, however, of being led astray by false issues. The alternative does not lie, as is so often asserted, between the Government policy of Home Rule, and the so-called policy of coercion. It is the function of every Government to coerce, to hold in check, to restrain the unruly passions of men : the Phœnix Park murders were followed by coercive measures : the Government of to-day is coercing the rioters of Belfast : it is the duty of every civilised Government to maintain the law, and to uphold its authority. But it is false to assume that statesmen who recognise this duty can know no other policy. The prison, alas ! must have its place in the best-ordered State : but whilst the ruler shrinks not from the repression of crime, his thoughts are chiefly given to the amelioration of the condition of his subjects, and the promotion of the welfare of the law-abiding classes. It is a libel upon the statesmanship of this country to assert that there is no alternative between an ill-considered, unjust, and impracticable measure, and a coercive policy. The problem of governing Ireland is a difficult one, rendered tenfold more so by the proposals now advanced : but its solution will be found in wise and temperate measures : certainly no real statesman wishes to find it in the policy of coercion.

It would be unwise, however, for us to assume that we can escape from our present difficulties by any single stroke of statesmanship. The political sky has been too long overcast, to be thus quickly cleared : there have been forces long in operation which stand in the way of any sudden solution of the problem of Irish government. We must beware of impatience in dealing with it, or we shall be hastily adopting remedies which will prove worse than the disease. There are signs of this impatience in the rapid conversion of so many politicians to the doctrines they have hitherto condemned.

The Irish difficulty is largely aggravated by the spirit of lawlessness which prevails. The Government proposes to give to the law-breaking classes the power of enacting their own laws : and we are assured that they will respect the laws which are thus made. Perhaps they will. But of what nature will those laws be ? The Government itself distrusts their equity, by proposing at a vast cost to withdraw the owners of property from their operation, and by securing to the Judges of the land an easy retreat from the offices which they now hold : whilst those classes which are loyal to the rule under which they have hitherto prospered, declare that nothing shall ever induce them to submit to the authority of an executive taken from the ranks of their hereditary foes.

By pandering, then, to the spirit of lawlessness, you strengthen and encourage it : you hand over the law-abiding classes to the tyranny of a faction : you capitulate ignobly to those who have long avowed themselves to be the enemies of England : and you basely desert those men whose chief pride has been their devotion to the Union. Is this wise ? Is this just ? Is this politic ? Viewed in the light of common sense, and apart from the influence of party, the political question appears to me to admit of but one solution.

But whilst we must beware of impatience in dealing with this grave question, let us not give way to discouragement. The political outlook is not without some hopeful signs. National disruption has not yet become an accomplished fact : politicians of the first rank, men of liberal views, of long experience, and, what is perhaps even more to the point, of tried devotion to the cause of Irish prosperity, have at great sacrifice broken loose from party ties, and condemned the policy of a Government with which they were otherwise in full accord : representatives but recently elected, with the threat of dissolution hanging over them, have preferred patriotism to self-interest, and have voted against a measure which they could not in their consciences approve : whilst, in view of the coming struggle, the leaders of two great parties have agreed to lay aside their differences, and to join as one man in maintaining the unity of the Empire, and the lasting welfare of the State.

Nor should it be forgotten in this national crisis that we live under a very different rule from that which existed when the threatenings of Jewish disruption were first heard. A constitutional monarch differs widely from an Oriental despot : but the influence of the throne is ever great. We have noted some of the evils which the sin of Solomon entailed upon his country : it is impossible to gauge the benefits which the virtues of our Queen have conferred upon our land. Whatever sins may

invite the judgment of God, we can trace none of them to the influence of the Court: and, whatever controversy God may have with us, we may find encouragement in remembering that the righteousness which exalteth a nation has ever been illustrated in the life, and enforced by the example, of Queen Victoria.

To-day we celebrate her accession to the throne. To-day she enters upon the 50th year of her reign. We know well how sincerely she desires the happiness of all her subjects. May she live to see that happiness largely increased: may she live to see the abatement of rivalry, the extinction of faction, the elevation of all parties in the State to a higher level of unselfish patriotism; may the danger which now threatens quickly pass away: and may she reign long over what still is, and, we trust, will long continue a prosperous and united Empire.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

# The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 26, 1886.

## BROWNING.

IT seems to us that a good knowledge of English poetry of a high class is a most valuable acquisition for a clergyman. Poets of the first rank are necessarily men of genius; and as such have a profound knowledge of human nature—and such a knowledge of human nature is (one might say) one half of theology. The knowledge, therefore, which a clerical student derives from the poets has a direct professional bearing. Especially in connection with sermon-making is such a knowledge extremely useful. An apt illustration from a good poet is often most telling from an argumentative point of view; and most agreeable also by way of break or relief. Archdeacon Farrar probably overdoes quotations from the English poets in his sermons: but at the same time one must recognise the great fitness and beauty of his selections. Tennyson and Browning are both theological poets. The *In Memoriam* has been called the Gospel of modern thought; and, as we shall see presently, the theological element is largely present in Browning. It must be borne in mind that his writings, with few exceptions, are not milk for babes, but strong meat for men of full age. His poems are said to be English oak with the bark on; and certainly they are often very rough and rugged. Mr. Froude compared a severe jolting over thirty miles of South African roads to the effect of a study of Browning; and such illustrations show the difficulty which this author presents even to highly educated readers. Still it is well worth the trouble to study him; it is a mental tonic, and by degrees the very difficulties of the task become one of the elements of its attractiveness. It seems there is a society for the study of Browning, but we have little or no sympathy with such associations—in the present day they are multiplied *ad nauseam*. Some people cannot bring themselves to read, or pray, or practise music, etc., without joining some association, which binds them down to an hour of such work every day. They must be very feeble folk. But to return to Browning; he is eminently a theological poet, and as such is specially worthy of being studied by clergymen. We shall mention a few of his pieces. "The Epistle of Karshish the Arab Physician." Karshish has met Lazarus of Bethany, and supposes his was a case

> Of trance prolonged unduly some three days.

But Lazarus assures him

> That he was dead and then restored to life
> By a Nazarene physician of his tribe.

Moreover that

> This man so cured regards the curer, then,
> As—God forgive me! who but God Himself.

The effect produced on the mind of Lazarus by his temporary experience of the world to come is described in a most interesting way at considerable length:

> Heaven opened to a soul while yet on earth,
> Earth forced on a soul's use while seeing Heaven:
> The man is witless of the sire, the sum,
> The value in proportion of all things,
> Or whether it be little or be much.

The conclusion of this poem is extremely fine; Karshish regards Lazarus as mad, but he is evidently becoming more and more impressed with his explanation of the case; and is half inclined to believe it.

> The very God! think Abib, dost thou think
> So the All-Great, were the All-loving too—
> So, through the thunder comes a human voice
> Saying, "O heart I made, a heart beats here!
> Face my hands fashioned, see it in myself!
> Thou hast no power nor may'st conceive of mine:
> But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
> And thou must love me, who have died for thee!"
> The madman saith He said so: it is strange.

"Caliban upon Setebos or National Theology in the Island," is such a very difficult poem we do not attempt any analysis of it within our present narrow limits. Only we advise beginners to leave it alone until they have acquired some familiarity with our author's style. Of the distinctively theological poems "Bishop Blougram's Apology" is perhaps the best—it is certainly a marvellous composition. It is full, too, of modern interest, as it refers to

Straüss, Fichte, and Newman. It is an after-dinner confidential conversation in which

> The great bishop rolled him out a mind
> Long rumpled, till creased consciousness lay smooth.

This poem will bear any number of readings. The Bishop states and replies to difficulties with the greatest candour; he strikingly observes that when a doubter has taken the final step, his doubting begins to be invaded by faith, just as formerly his faith had been invaded by doubt:

> All we have gained, then, by our unbelief
> Is a life of doubt diversified by faith.
> For one of faith diversified by doubt:
> We called the chess-board white—we call it black.

"A Death in the Desert" describes the last moments of the Apostle St. John: it is another of these deeply thoughtful and thoroughly theological poems. Of a lighter class is the poem entitled "The Bishop orders his Tomb in St. Praxed's Church."

This is a charming composition; the plot is as follows. The bishop is on his death-bed, surrounded by his nephews (but really his sons), marriage not being permitted in his age. His great object is to have a beautiful tomb, and thereby outdo a rival called Gandolph. Gandolph had supplanted him in the seizure of a coveted corner of the Church, but he is determined to surpass him in the material of his tomb—"Gandolph shall not choose, but see and burst." His material he had obtained by burning down his church and carrying off from the conflagration what he coveted. He tells his sons where the precious treasure is hidden.

Then the inscription on his tomb must also outdo Gandolph's:

> Choice Latin, picked phrase, Tully's every word,
> No gaudy ware like Gandolph's second line—
> Tully my masters? Ulpian serves his need!

He reflects on his happy position buried in the church thus:—

> And then how I shall lie through centuries
> And hear the blessed mutter of the mass,
> And see God made and eaten all day long,
> And feel the steady candle flame, and taste
> Good strong, thick, stupefying incense-smoke.

Altogether he is a thorough old heathen of the time of Leo the Tenth, who confesses his impurities and trickeries without the slightest compunction; his jealousy of Gandolph is as strong in death as in life, and his greatest anxieties are about the material of his tomb and the correctness of its art and inscription. In order to induce his sons to obey his dying requests, he says—

> And have I not Saint Praxed's ear to pray
> Horses for ye, and brown Greek manuscripts,
> And mistresses with great, smooth, marbly limbs.
> ——That's if ye carve my epitaph aright.

Another character study of this kind, almost but perhaps not quite so good, is entitled "Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister."

One monk is intensely jealous of the sanctity of a brother Laurence in the same convent. He doubts his sanctity for several reasons—among others

> When he finishes refection,
> Knife and fork he never lays
> Cross-wise to my recollection,
> As do I, in Jesus' praise.
> I the Trinity illustrate
> Drinking watered orange-pulp—
> In three sips the Arian frustrate;
> While he drains his at one gulp.

The envious monk lays several plans for the damnation of Laurence, among others this:

> There's a great text in Galatians,
> Once you trip on it, entails
> Twenty-nine distinct damnations;
> One sure, if another fails:
> If I trip him just a-dying,
> Sure of Heaven as sure can be,
> Spin him round and send him flying
> Off to hell, a Manichee!

Some of the shorter pieces are very simple and readable, *e.g.*, "An incident of the French Camp," "Up at a Villa—Down in the City," and that exquisite one, "Home Thoughts from Abroad," and everyone knows "How we brought the Good News from Ghent to Aix." It is, however, with the theological or psychological poems we are chiefly concerned, and they will amply repay any study bestowed upon them. Browning loves to make poetical travel accessible only to the Livingstones of literature. But be patient.

> As long I dwell on some stupendous
> And tremendous (Heaven defend us!)
> *Monstr'—inform'—ingens—horrend*—ous
> Demoniaco—seraphic,
> Penman's latest piece of graphic.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the* CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

### SELF-DENIAL.

SIR,—It is always well, in controversy, to know exactly where we are, and the truth for which we are contending. It will be well, therefore, to state briefly once more the position that I took up on this question of self-denial—"denying to oneself little pleasures" was no virtue. This definition of self-denial, as I apprehend, is the one generally received. It is the one which, I suppose, Mr. Brigstocke defends.

In his last letter he produced Scripture authority to overturn my arguments. I showed him clearly enough that the passages he adduced gave him no assistance whatever. This week he refers no more to Scripture, but to a sermon of his. I hope he will not consider himself too badly used, if I remind him that the Bible is the great authority with me. I call no man master. But let us examine what he says, so far at least as he produces anything in the shape of argument.

I do not, as a rule, use illustrations, as they are capable of many applications. He has made this clear by the way he has used mine. I do not defend that illustration further than it served to make my meaning clear. I shall not refer to his illustration for

any other purpose than to show that it does not help his argument at all.

The question first to determine with respect to the drunkard entering, or refusing to enter, the public house is this—What was his duty? There is only one answer. It was clearly not his duty to go near it. The next question is—Whether he should do it willingly or not willingly. This also admits of but one answer. A duty grudgingly performed is unacceptable to God. This is clear. Where, then, is self-denial? It is evidently put out of court.

I wonder that Mr. Brigstocke does not see that all he said against my illustration is equally applicable to his. Will he try to think it out?

I cannot, of course, give Mr. Brigstocke the power of apprehension. I wish I could. I can and do ask him to think. He must acknowledge that the best way to ascertain the Saviour's meaning is to study His words in the original. Those words were: *ἀπαρνησασθω ἑαυτον.* The translators have given a correct translation: "Let him deny himself." The fault is not theirs, but ours; for we persist in rendering them: "Let him deny to himself." The omission, or otherwise, of that little word "to," makes all the difference.

I hope by this time Mr. Brigstocke will see that what I have written is in strict accordance with the teaching of Scripture. If he thinks there are passages which seem to refute my views, I shall be glad to have them pointed out for consideration.

I admit readily that there may be instances—undoubtedly there are many—where the Christian has to exercise what seems to him self-denial, in the general acceptation of the term, but all such cases, to my mind at least, only illustrate the fact that little progress has been made in the Christian life.

I read "Presbyter's" letter with some interest. I did not think that his views of the matter were quite in harmony with the teaching of Scripture. The point of his letter, if I understand him aright, is in these words: "The essence of Christian self-denial is the substitution of Christ's will for our own will." I suppose he would have in his mind, when he wrote this, St. Paul's words: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." I am not sure that this touches the question of self-denial at all. I shall be glad if "Presbyter" will indicate the point of contact. I think, if "Presbyter's" view be rigidly applied, it will result in the annihilation of the personality of the Christian. If I might say so, I should be disposed to alter his words and give them this shape: "The essence of the Christian life is in the submission of our own will to that of the Lord Jesus Christ." But here self-denial, as it is understood, is eliminated. The question is a large one, and does not admit of an easy, off-hand solution. I can quite understand, for instance, how that some would be at once ready to reply, that by this last sentence I have admitted that the accepted view of self-denial is the right one. I have, however, done nothing of the kind. My views of the matter are not hastily formed without thought, and irrespective of Scriptural teaching. They are the exact contrary. J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, June 12th, 1886.

## OUR COLOURS.

SIR,—In the happily increasing desire for union amongst all loyal men to preserve our Empire whole and undivided, there is a want which has not yet been met, I mean a distinctive colour marking this political union. May I suggest that *purple* is the best colour; an imperial colour, worthy of display in the coming struggle where our country must choose between remaining imperial or being cut up into fragments; for I cannot suppose that if the Irish ideas of the Premier succeed, the example of independent Home Rule will stop at Ireland.

The advocates of the "Disruption and Plunder Bill" have their colours to hand, the same that the Fenians carry—the green flag. They are welcome to it; for its colour bespeaks the "greenness" of its friends, if they expect to force their views on the nation at large for any length of time. The Premier looks complacently on England having to "reconquer Ireland," if his very green projects do not ripen into the wholesome fruits of peace and goodwill. Such an issue to his experiments in legislation, can only be contemplated calmly by a statesman who supposes that "the evil shall not happen in his day." As many of your readers may hope to outlive the Premier, we shall do well to think more carefully of the future, nip this evil fruit in the bud, and save ourselves and our successors reaping a harvest of national repentance baptised in blood. It required some such momentous crisis to draw the thinking classes of our nation together, and foreigners may learn a lesson from the example of patriotism so bravely exhibited by our ablest public men, notwithstanding their great diversity of opinion. But our political union for a noble end must have some colour to mark it. I hope no time will be lost; let Liberals, Radicals, and Conservative Unionists agree about this.

P.

June 22nd, 1886.

## WHAT WILL THE JOURNALS SAY?

SIR,—An article in the *Contemporary*, "Government by Journalism," reminds me that whilst books may sometimes convince their thousands, the journalistic press can alone convince its tens of thousands—*i.e.* the public. Will you therefore permit me to submit to your readers a few new facts on an old subject, which if at first sight difficult to believe, are at least easy to verify?

The facts are briefly these—

1. That if for the sake of clearness we mentally cancel the section of St. Luke's Gospel xi. 14—xiii. 21, the rest of his narrative is, with four merely nominal exceptions, in exact chronological agreement with St. Mark and St. John.

2. That a distinct and intelligible order of events in our Lord's life is thus established by three witnesses, all being Evangelists.

3, That the order thus established shows at once how, why, and when St. Matthew subordinates considerations of chronological sequence to a well-defined plan of writing.

4. That St. Luke's habit of elucidating the order of St. Matthew and St. Mark requires the above section to be read between the 21st and 22nd verses of Luke viii.

5. That if, when our section is moved as suggested, Gospel facts and statements are numbered from 1 to 364, it will appear that whenever the same fact or statement occurs in two or more Gospels, the number

under which it necessarily falls is, save only in five minor instances in St. Mark and a few due to St. Matthew's plan of writing, the same in each Evangelist.

6. That the transpositions required to make the numbers coincide in the above exceptional cases differ from those suggested in ordinary harmonies (*a*) in the rarity of their occurrence, (*b*) in that they are made by rule and not by conjecture, the rule being "follow St. Luke's order implicitly and without exception," and (*c*) in that they never violate any express or implied statement of the narrative in which the transposition occurs. The one or two apparent exceptions to *c* admit of easy explanation.

From the above facts it will appear that by only one real alteration—an alteration possibly if not demonstrably due to a corruption of the original text—and by accepting the few obvious elucidations of order given by St. Luke, we are able to bring all the Gospels into perfect harmony, and at the same time to obtain a narrative which commends itself to our judgment as much for the supreme fitness as for the orderly development of all its parts.

How this one alteration, with its multitudinous consequences, comes to be required is a matter perhaps rather interesting than important. Its extremely artificial character, and the extraordinary manner in which it at once disposes of a vast number of otherwise inexplicable difficulties seems necessarily to point to an original process of shifting the exact reverse of that which is required to rectify it, in other words to a displacement, effected either by accident or design.

The circumstances do not admit of this theory being disposed of by an unreasoning *non placet*.

The objector is bound at least to suggest some other hypothesis, and one, too, which, equally with that which he rejects, shall account for all the phenomena, viz.—(1) that this section constitutes an altogether unique instance of a *wide* departure in St. Luke from the order observed by St. Mark, and in the main at this point by St. Matthew also; (2) that its removal brings St. Luke and St. John into singular harmony; (3) that its removal to another point makes all its serrate edges agree in circumstantial, and even verbal, detail with the history of two other writers, whose narratives are elsewhere invariably elucidated by St. Luke, as by the insertion of our section they are in this case; and (4) that at three several points of junction the broken connection of the present order is as conspicuous as the continuity of the restored order.

Many of your readers will doubtless remember the essay by which Schleiermacher was supposed by many, and especially by Bishop Thirlwall, the English editor of his work, to have established the fact that St. Luke was only a "compiler." Its whole argument turns upon the complications of this part of St. Luke's Gospel, and especially on "the first striking instance" of the manner in which he is supposed to have cut away the beginnings of narratives. This instance is found at the beginning of our section (xi. 14). His next instance is found at its end (xiii. 22). In the latter case it is not a little remarkable that if our section be removed, the narrative which then precedes it does *literatim et verbatim* exactly what the critical insight of the great German scholar leads him to affirm that it ought to have done.

To estimate the true measure of the probability of the theory of displacement we must bear in mind that all the facts are very suggestive of an alteration originating in a mere lectionary arrangement, due partly to a want of appreciation of the design of St. Luke's order and a consequent desire to avoid an appearance of discrepancy, and partly to a wish to emphasise striking parallelisms between St. Mark and St. Luke by removing narratives mostly peculiar to the latter, and reading them consecutively.

J. J. HALCOMBE,
Balsham Rectory, Cambridge, May 28th, 1886.

## HADES NOT HELL.

SIR,—I have read with much pleasure and profit Bishop Hill's practical sermon in your last issue; but there is one passage in it which requires comment. "'And in hell'... These are not my words; there are people nowadays who don't believe in hell, but I am giving you now the words of my Lord and Master." Surely, sir, the Bishop cannot be ignorant that the original here is ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ and that the Revised Version translates it rightly, "And in Hades he lifted up," &c.

CRITIC.

HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN, FOR JULY, 1886. — SELECTED BY THE REV. JOHN NAPLETON.— Second Sunday after Trinity. Morning: 2, 160, 317. Evening: 374, 166, 366.—Third Sunday after Trinity. Morning: 258, 91, 168. Evening: 276, 175, 13.—Fourth Sunday after Trinity. Morning: 167, 289, 367. Evening: 177, 285, 446.—Fifth Sunday after Trinity. Morning: 418, 180, 318. Evening: 431, 181, 30.

THE annual meeting of the Manchester and Salford Church Day-Schools Association was held recently. Bishop Moorhouse, who presided, observed that in the colony from which he had just come all the schools were Government schools, and the natural tendency of the assumption of the management of all schools by the Government was that education had become free. It was almost impossible to prevent that consequence. It seemed to the working man an extremely desirable thing that he should be relieved from the expense of his children's education, and when the working man could put pressure upon those who were managing all schools—that was the Government—the Government was almost compelled at last to give way, so that the assumption of all our schools by the Government would inevitably, he thought, end in education becoming free. The result in Victoria had been a perceptible lowering of the sense of responsibility for the children's education on the part of the parents. The best evidence of that was the extreme difficulty with which children were compelled to attend school. The average attendance of Victoria was very low indeed—astonishingly low. He had not got the figures at hand, but if he had them and could quote them he was sure they would be astonished at the proportion of average attendance to the number of children in the country. There were, it was true, two causes to account for that. The children lived in country districts at great distances from the schools, and labour was exceptionally valuable in the colony, but for all that he saw most distinctly that the fact that they paid nothing for the education made the poor people do less. (Cheers.) When a man felt that he had to provide simply for the physical wants

of his children, he felt that having discharged that responsibility he had done all that was required of him. And there was another reason why it was very difficult for him to keep up a sense of responsibility with regard to the education of his children. A Government system of education where it was free was an extremely centralised system. There was a Secretary of State for education, there were the inspectors, and there was the schoolmaster, and those three great authorities had created amongst them an extremely complicated system of regulations. The ordinary man felt it was extremely hopeless for him to attempt to understand them, and he never tried. That really had been the effect in the first instance, but there had followed another effect from the adoption of free education; the education of the country had been increasingly expensive, so that the burden of the free education of the people had become almost crushing, and it was actually proposed before he left the colony to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the causes of the rapidly augmenting expenses. All that was easily understood by those who had watched what was going on. In the first place those who, belonging to the middle classes, had formerly paid for their children's education, refused to go on paying. They argued thus: "I am compelled to pay my share of the free education of all the children in the colony, and now you ask me to pay for the expenses of my own children at high schools and middle-class schools, and I see no reason in it." The consequence was that nearly all the intermediate schools and most of the private schools had gone by the board. Not only had the working classes their children educated free, but the middle classes had for the most part the education of their children free also. Another potent agency making the education expensive was the absence of all competition. While the Voluntary schools in this country were obliged to increase the efficieney of their education in order to earn the Government grant, they were obliged to keep down the price of it. Because they did that, and exhibited their results in their balance-sheet, the Board schools were obliged to imitate them, for they knew very well that their schools would be brought in comparison with others if the education given in the Board schools was startlingly out of proportion in respect of expense to the Voluntary schools. Competition with the Voluntary schools thus kept down the charges in the School Boards. Sweep away all this competition, and let there be nobody to check it, they would very soon find that the expense of each child's education in the country would be doubled, so that they would not only have the children of the middle classes educated free, but every child's education would cost twice as much. If all the schools became Government schools, if the clergy gave up their Voluntary schools into the hands of the Government, the country would suffer—(cheers)—and if the burden of taxation was sufficiently crushing now, it would be a burden impossible to bear by-and-by. The supporters of Voluntary schools were therefore great benefactors to the English taxpayer, and he ought with all his power to keep them at work in order to keep down the burden of the taxation he had to bear. (Cheers.) He need not, however, tell them that that was not the primary point with those who were keeping the Voluntary schools open. They believed that so long as they had Voluntary schools they would have the right to teach their children that the Bible was the Word of God. (Cheers.)

THE Queen has accepted the resignation of Canon Knollys as Permanent Preacher and Reader at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, which he had held since 1860, and has appointed as his successor the Rev. Edgar Sheppard, Sub-Dean of the Chapel Royal. In future the post will be merged in the Sub-Deanship.

## PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alder, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Vicar of Waterbeach.
Aldridge, Rev. George Augustus, Vicar of East Moreden and Rector of Charborough.
Boag, Rev. George, Curate-in-Charge of Distington; Perpetual Curate of Winster.
Bowman, Rev. Arthur Herbert, B.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Buchanan, Rev. A., Rector of Doynton, Gloucestershire.
Chanter, Rev. John Frederick, M.A., Rector of Parracombe.
Dixon, Rev. Thomas Featherston, M.A., Rector of Willesborough, Kent.
Hudson, Rev. Francis, M.A., Vicar of St. Margaret under River, Kent.
Glover, Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of Whittlesford.
Kyngdon, Rev. George Theodosius Boughton, M.A., Curate of Boconnock and Braddock; Rector of St. Michael's, Caerhayes.
Leach, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rector of Ashchurch, Gloucestershire.
Marshall, Rev. Thomas George, M.A., Curate of St. Sidwell, Exeter; Perpetual Curate of Lee St. Matthew.
Oliver, Rev. W. Elliott, Vicar of St. Mary's, Ealing.
Pellew, Rev. George Israel, B.A., Rector of Peterstow.
Powell, Rev. George John, M.A., Vicar of Stanford-cum-Swinford.
Rees, Rev. S. D., Vicar of St. George's, Charlestown. Manchester; Surrogate.
Richardson, Rev. Francis, Vicar of St. Paul's, Carlisle; Vicar of Corbridge.
Seddon, Rex. W. H., Vicar of Painswick, Gloucestershire.
Sutton, Rev. Edward, Rector of Elmley.
Thursfield, Rev. John, Vicar of St. Edmund's, Leeds.
Topham, Rev. Samuel, Curate-in-Charge of Hennock.
Vatcher, Rev. J. R. M., Rector of Great Witcombe, Gloucestershire.
Wainwright, Rev. Samuel, D.D., Minister of the Chapel of St. Stephen's, Clapham-park.
Ware, Rev. Wilmot Westmoreland, M.A., Rector of Barnbrough, near Doncaster, and Proctor in Convocation for the Northern Province; Prebendary of Tockerington in York Cathedral.

## CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Abraham, Rev. Thomas Edward, for twenty-three years Rector of Risby, Honorary Canon of Ely and Rural Dean, at Risby Rectory, on the 16th inst., aged 73.
Carr, Rev. Edward, LL.D., Canon of Liverpool, and for forty years Incumbent of St. Helen's, formerly Incumbent of St. John's, Guernsey, at the Vicarage, St. Helen's, Lancashire, on the 21st inst., aged 79.
Edmeades, Rev. W. H., at Nurstead Court, Kent, on the 13th inst., aged 82.
Fisk, Rev. John Hammond, at Eastcliffe House, Hastings, on the 4th inst., aged 93.
Fox, Rev. George Townsend, late Vicar of St. Nicholas', Durham, on the 17th inst., aged 75.
Malden, Rev. Clifford, at St. Lawrence Rectory, Ventnor, on the 18th inst., aged 53.
Ridley, Rev. John Ridley, M.A., Vicar of Norton, Stockton-on-Tees, at Ilkley, on the 11th inst., aged 58.
Scott, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Wisbech, and Rural Dean, at the Vicarage, Wisbech, on the 17th inst., in his 77th year.
Thorpe, Rev. Henry, at the Rectory, Aston-le-Walls, on the 14th inst., in the 83rd year of his age, and the 55th of his incumbency.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 028229307